Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Foster
mental health
3808 Carr Pl N
Seattle, WA 98103

2069993477
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

MaryAnn Mabbott  
13340 198thAve NE  
Woodinville, WA 98077

(206) 660-6440
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mechelle Hannahs
10607 50th ave e
Tacoma, WA 98446
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

KS Taylor Stone
9509 NE 135th court
Vancouver, WA 98682
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Becky Anderson
2043 Ponderosa Ct
Bellingham, WA 98229

3606716985
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Scott Groce
5034 N Visscher St
Apt #12
Tacoma, WA 98407
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Vestal
9606 E Valleyway Ave
Spokane Valley, WA 99206

509 891 2453
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Debra Bews
Tillamook
Walla walla, WA 99362
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lois Danks
1621 South F St
Port Angeles, WA 98363

360-452-7534
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sonia Stanton
10022Meydenbauer Way SE Apt 212
Bellevue, WA 98004
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Janet Moore
11246 NE 92nd ST
Kirkland, WA 98033
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christina O’Toole
2512 26th Ct SW
Olympia, WA 98512

(360) 878-8750
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Leslie Faris
18210 Dayton Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

kelli delaney
326 main st
algona, WA 98001
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dirk Burgon
617 Canyon View Drive
Bellingham, WA 98225

360-778-2287
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anne Peterson
24620 Russell Rd.
U-102
Kent, WA 98032
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christina Dyson
58 157th ave se
Bellevue, WA 98008
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Thomas W. Schmidt
1614 E. 33rd
Spokane, WA 99203
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lin Sunseri
16220 S Sherman Rd
1
Cheney, WA 99004

5094438586
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judith Prowell
1914 165th Pl. N.E.
Bellevue, WA 98008
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Redmond
1908 Piper Circle
Anacortes, WA 98221
Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judy Friesem
353 Wallace Way NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lyssa Mercier
1920 9th Ave W
Seattle, WA 98119

4255665111
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon Parshall
4348 336th Pl SE
Fall City, WA 98024
000-000-0000
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Shirley Peters
10815 110TH ST SW
Lakewood, WA 98498

2342543020
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Paradie Stewart

Paradie Stewart
8435 SE Insley St #21
Portland, OR 97266
Dear Mr. Scott,

I don't know how Canadian regulatory system works. But I do know that the US American regulatory system was designed to assist in granting permits that only LIMIT the AMOUNT of harm that can be done to the environment. Our system -- which came out of environmental activism in the 1960s and early 1970s, and of which I was a part -- has failed to protect the environment. I believe we activists were slightly naive, and were deceived and tricked into believing that the US Environmental Protection Agency and other departments of "environmental quality" would do what their names say they will do. But some of us are realizing that the corporations and their people administer and control our regulatory system. You can read about a movement that is combating this now dire situation through passing local laws the fight against this corruption of our lives. http://celdf.org/section.php?id=423

Even though I am from the U.S., I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar
sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our
opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of
tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and
seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marian Drake
5800 NE Center Commons Way Apt. 213
Apt. 213
Portland, OR 97213

503-236-1736
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency, the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Heather Tillman
1291 E. Marrowstone
Nordland, WA 98358

360-379-1434
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Heather Tillman
1291 E. Marrowstone
Nordland, WA 98358

360-379-1434
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jack Mackie
8510 Main St
A202
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fullyScoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tom Kruse
200 Cascadia Loop
Sequim, WA 98382

360-797=1943
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port's previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Margaret HASHMI
3704 TREE FARM LANE
BELLINGHAM, WA 98226

360 752-0075
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Margaret HASHMI
3704 TREE FARM LANE
BELLINGHAM, WA 98226

360 752-0075
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ben Hughey
1713 Dexter Ave N
201
Seattle, WA 98109

9077381252
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tyler Otto
23901 SE 241st Street
Maple Valley, WA 98038

2069096289
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dana Beebe
2000 SW Andover Street
Seattle, WA 98106
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Meryle A. Korn
2821 Huron St.
Bellingham, WA 98226

503 281 7475
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joanna Soren
443 SE Alder Dr
North Bend, WA 98045
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scope
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Reilly
1703 Giles Ave NW
Olympia, WA 98502
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joseph Rowa
4or 1o2nd Ave SE
Belevue, WA 98004

425-455-9594
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Willie McCoy
702 2nd ave w 103
Seattle, WA 99119
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bruce Shilling
7120 Linden Ave. N.
Seattle, WA 98103

1111111111
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Neatha Lefevre
Vancouver, Washington
No Coal Exports/Sierra Club

Neatha Lefevre
3804 E. McLoughlin Blvd
Vancouver, WA 98661
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sanja Futterman  
9510 20th ave ne  
Seattle, WA 98115  
2065249645
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Matthew Anderson
13522 Densmore Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

2063661782
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Peter Holcomb
2332 E.Hemmi Rs
Bellingham, WA 98226

360-966-0176
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Peter Albrecht
5021 E Fairview Ave
Spokane, WA 99217

509-489-4753
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sandra Olson
5455 Vistaire Place
Langley, WA 98260
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judy Dragoo
2 Cedarwood Ct
Aberdeen, WA 98520
 Fraser Surrey Docks  

Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2  

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt  

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River  

Dear Mr. Scott,  

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:  

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.  

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:  

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.  

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.  

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.  

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

John Eddy
622 N airview Dr
Tacoma, WA 98406

253-564-4351
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Susan and Kit Hanes

Kit and Susan Hanes
12 Windward Dr
Bellingham, WA 98229
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jay Russo
1262 Duncan Creek Road
Stevenson, WA 98648

5094275002
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Antoinette Jacks
1441 E. Aloha St Apt 102
Apt. 102
Seattle, WA 98112

206-322-1291
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tom Amend
3015 Cowgill ave
Bellingham, WA 98225

3603198133
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laura Boss
905 SW 96th Place
Seattle, WA 98106

(206) 935-3375
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes
new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.
Sincerely,

James Soares  
PO BOX 559  
Everson, WA 98247
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Andrea Higgins
24212 4th PL W
Bothell, WA 98021

425-379-5779
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Dotson
102 Anderson St., Apt. B
Carterville, IL 62918

6188895337
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Loula Gregg
ret. social worker
130 Main Ave. S Apt. 402
Apt. 303
Renton, WA 98057
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brian Gunn
2305 27TH PL SE
Auburn, WA 98002

253-334-8614
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judith Dunn Lee
820 Cook Rd
Serous-Woolley, WA 98284
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Maxine Clark
1717 sheridan rd c4
Bremerton, WA 98310

360-943-7332
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freightraker traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Sola
1204 18th Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98112
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tamara Saarinen
4418 Rosedale St Nw
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

253-548-3502
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bonnie O’Brien
20205 SE 152nd Street
Renton, WA 98059
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kenneth R. Beasley
1037 N.E.65th.St.,#127
Seattle, WA 98115
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

nate marino
2878 lazer lane
bellingham, WA 98226
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joe Wiederhold
1405 Edwards St
BELLINGHAM, WA 98229

5414901389
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Schroff
20300 Noll Road NE
Poulsbo, WA 98370
360 697 5884
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Lee
5533 37th Ave SE
Lacey, WA 98503

(360) 413-7667
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Shannon Markley
P.O. Box 31382
P.O. Box
Seattle, WA 98103

206-321-7852
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Suzann Finch
308 Carolina
Bellingham, WA 98225
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Mahan
1463 E Republican St., #120
Seattle, WA 98112
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency, the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Schmidt
2216 so rockwood bl
Spokane, WA 99203
(509) 368-9962
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anne Schreibe
14623 8th Ave SW
Burien, WA 98166
206-241-4457
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Brown
1443 Edwards Avenue
#301
Fircrest, WA 98466

253-302-4480
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Pam Workman
2010
Bellingham, WA 98229
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sherrina Kane
10511 Linden Avenue N
Seattle, WA 98133
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tony Buch
6221 35th Ave
Seattle, WA 98115

206-931-8552
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joan Morabito
705 Mt Olympus Ave se
Ocean Shores, WA 98569
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Damiana Seabrook
10446 Alderbrook Pl. N.W.
Seattle, WA 98177
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Mary Ewald

Mary Ewald
1703 13th Ave.
Seattle, WA 98122
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Felber
5413 State Route 20
Port Townsend, WA 98368

3603850202
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hines
10302 23rd Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

206-524-3303
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jayson Luu
3815 NE 4th St. Apt A20
Seattle
Renton, WA 98056

2063723764
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Daniel Sandvig
21727 Calhoun Rd
Monroe, WA 98272

(360) 794-4282
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Shawn O'Grady
23010 139 Ave NE
Arlington, WA 98223
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

judith cohen
1608 E.republican st
seattle, WA 98112

2006 333 4444
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fullyscoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Aela Truheart
NE 99th ct
vancouver, WA 98662
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lopez
214 NW 52nd Street
Seattle, WA 98107
2064534644
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Roy Edfast
900 University St
Seattle, WA 98101
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Brian and Mary Sweeney
1526 Alki Avenue SW #407
Seattle, WA 98116

Mary Sweeney
1526 Alki Avenue SW Unit 407
Seattle, WA 98116
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Kelly
7051 35th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

no phone
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you're proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Greg Espe
6278 -20th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115
Fraser Surrey Docks

the ignorance of men is the enemy of mama nature
why is it that the most educated people commit the worst crimes against nature and humanity?
men has turn earth into a painful place for all living beings...when you do wrong nothing goes unpunished
Stop the war against the environment by men
I blame you for being cruel

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.
• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
nando a.
16625 kent des moines rd
des moines, WA 98198

2063837002
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James Boerner
12964 Magnolia Ln.
Mount Vernon, WA 98273
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Linn
918 Hassalo Ave SE
Ocean Shores, WA 98569

3605895805
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Martin Barr
812 NE 128th St
Seattle, WA 98125
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

Tax payers are getting raped. Oil spills are impossible to cleanup and corporations don’t do a good job of cleaning - therefore taxpayers must do the cleanup. The Salish Sea is impossible to clean - Period.

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted
overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hamilton Dutcher3

Hamilton Dutcher3
1501 Samish way s.
Bellingham, WA 98229
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fullyScoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laurette Culbert
5123 2nd Ave. NW
Seattle, WA 98107

206 783-5330
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Sigman
149 Karr Ave
Hoquiam, WA 98550
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Ralph
21002 36th Ave W
Lynnwood, WA 98036
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ms Diane Smith
1234 Chuckanut
Bellingham, WA 98229

3606761955
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon Saunders
1418 s mildred st apt 1305
Tacoma, WA 98465
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dale Kelley
102 Warbler Lane
Port Ludlow, WA 98365
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Pamela Engler
4754 shippin lane
Freeland, WA 98249

206-526-5984
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Hagel
916 E. Aloha St., Apt. C
Seattle, WA 98102

206 325-9779
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Shari Hamilton
1122 Caroline Street
Port Angeles, WA 98362
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Veronica Walvatne
2051 S. 263rd St.
Des Moines, WA 98198
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Colleen Curtis
120 Chuckanut Crest Dr.
Bellingham, WA 98229
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lynn Fitz-hugh
2210 NE 92nd St #307
Seattle, WA 98115

2067130497
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Justin Craig
7028 8 th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Langford
1221 S Grant Ave
Tacoma, WA 98405
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hali Panneton
1700 Langridge Ave. NW
Olympia, WA, WA 98502
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Shannon Fouts
1451 N Old Adobe Dr
Green Valley, AZ 85614

2065595624
Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anitra Hayes
26022 Pillsbury Rd SW
Vashon, WA 98070
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Little
PO Box 921
Aberdeen, WA 98520
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lengel
12901 S. Wildwood Lane
Anacortes, WA 98221
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Murphy
150 NE 95TH ST APT 411
Seattle, WA 98115

(206) 729-1568
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Calvert
1318 S. Mica Park Dr.
Spokane Valley, WA 99206

5095363839
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Annie Laurie Burke
PO Box 2159
110 E. Twilight Way
Allyn, WA 98524
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James M. Tandoo
15028 64th Ave W.
Edmonds, WA 98026

425.743.2233
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lisette west
6701 155 St nw
gig harbor, WA 98332

2063595650
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2  

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt  

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River  

Dear Mr. Scott,  

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:  

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.  

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:  

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.  

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.  

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.  

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susanne Lindberg
11526 Fremont ave N
Seattle, WA 98133
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James Hipp
609 Rosette Ct
Bellingham, WA 98226

3603933834
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Antoinette Boscacci
3226 80th Avenue NE
Marysville, WA 98270

4253149345
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Felicity Devlin
2417 N. Washington St
Tacoma, WA 98406

253 7618066
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dwight Beckmeyer
2128 N. 53rd St.
Seattle, WA 98103

206-547-8353
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Les Berenson MD
6603 Aurora Ave No.
Seattle, WA 98103
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joan York
14215  82 Ave NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98329
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Eugenia A. Patterson
27110 Woodside Rd. NE
Kingston, WA 98346

3602716847
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jerry Davios
213 Crown Lane
Bellingham, WA 98229
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hanadia Roby
5001 55th LN SE
apt Q303
Lacey, WA 98503
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah Efron
10129 Main Street, Apt 307
Apt 307
Bellevue, WA 98004

4254538541
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sheryl Wesley
593 Ocean Shores Blvd NW
Ocean Shores, WA 98569
3603109256
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

elyette weinstein
5000 Orvas Ct SE
olympia, WA 98501

360-664-7307
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

E Ross
Randall
Aberdeen, WA 98520

6198714147
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Rafe Dimmitt
2642 W PLYMOUTH ST
SEATTLE, WA 98199

(206) 963-4379
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Olivia de Vesci
4118 19th ave sw
Seattle, WA 98106
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James Rogers
8654 Old Military Rd NE
Bremerton, WA 98311

3606205290
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2  

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt  

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River  

Dear Mr. Scott,  

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:  

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.  

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:  

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.  

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.  

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.  

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

CASSANDRA MARTIN
211 E McLane Dr
Shelton, WA 98584
3604271035
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sherry Davis
2325 52nd Ave.
Longview, WA 98632
360-270-5658
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sarah Sloane
1410 201st Ln Apt 5
Ocean Park, WA 98640

3606650022
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

M O’Farrell
P.O. Box 12
Stanwood, WA 98292
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Max DeNise
2997 Crosby Blvd. SW -- #331
Tumwater, WA 98512

3604815611
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brianna Morgan
4041 NE 95th St
Seattle, WA 98115
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ronald Talbert
2519 1st Ave., Apt. 407
Apt. 407
Seattle, WA 98121
Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

david Ludden
2401 NE Blakeley st 302
Seattle, WA 98105

206-331-9708
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

david anderson
16004 e longfellow
spokane valley, WA 99216
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joe Thompson
809 N. 5th St.
Kalama, WA 98625

3606733135
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ronald Hawk
PO Box 33207
Seattle, WA 98133

206-225-5258
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joann Hutton
1901 Gilbert Rd.
1901 Gilbert Rd.
Ellensburg, WA 98926

509-968-4610
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Catherine Ross
19508 88th Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026

4257766376
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Debbie Spear
24013 133rd Ave SE
Snohomish, WA 98296
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cheri Carlson
20505  64th Dr NE
Arlington
Arlington, WA 98223
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Overton
242 4th Ave. S., #3
Edmonds, WA 98020
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ann Muzzey
22915 N.E. 25th Way
Sammamish, WA 98074
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Larry Lawton
18 Aberdeen Gardens Rd
Aberdeen, WA 98520
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jim Quinn
16306 NE 81st St
Vancouver, WA 98682
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nicole Green
16208 10th Ave NE
Shoreline, WA 98155

2063647899
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Glenn Thureson
4118 SW College St.
#301
Seattle, WA 98116
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kevin Schmidt
5186 NEW SWEDEN RD NE
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110
2062953755
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tom Oliveri
9455 37th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98126

206-257-9757
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks; 
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester; 
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Iris Moore
16937 Port Orford Blvd. SE
Yelm, WA 98597
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marsha Osborn
6241 S Wapato Lk Dr
Tacoma, WA 98408

2536834300
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marsha Adams
2201 Maple Valley Hwy
Renton, WA 98057

425-228-6584
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Geoff Briggs
8404 31st Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

(206) 351-2138
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Norm Conrad
919 N 97th St
Seattle, WA 98103

2065234735
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kristina Peterson
13510 n creek dr
Mill creek, WA 98012
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hillary Ostrow
5835 Hesperia Ave
Encino, CA 91316

8183459868
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Troy Henning
1727 Summit Ave
Apt 201
Seattle, WA 98122
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

melody risner
1040 michael way
camano island, WA 98282

360-387-7556
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

TOM DEVINE
2002 CAPITOLWAY S.E.
OLYMPIA, WA 98501
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Steve V.
323 E 2nd St
Port Angeles, WA 98362

3604573859
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kristi Brumfield
1617 Fones RD SE
#31
Olympia, WA 9501
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judy Mason
2615 163rd PL SE
Bellevue, WA 98008

425 746 4077
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Curry
253 Crescent Dr.
Kelso, WA 98626

360-577-1515
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sandra Rodgers
43000 NE Columbia Tie Road
Amboy, WA 98601
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Merryl Woodard
13401 Dumas Rd.
Mill Creek, WA 98012
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joanne Watchie
2440 Alki Ave SW, #202
Apt 202
Seattle, WA 98116

626-233-2951
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Wagner
3470 Viewsound Lane SE
Port Orchard, WA 98366
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary McDermott
5365 Stonehaven Drive Apt 107
Yorba Linda, CA 92887

7149707928
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jane Hadley
1725 30th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122

2063287605
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
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Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, your regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert W. West
5434 ORIOLE DR
LONGVIEW, WA 98632

360 636 3360
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Peha
14923 S.E. 183rd Street
Renton, WA 98058

4252287846
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Desiree Nagyfy
1120 E. Westmoreland Rd.
Deer Park, WA 99006
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Kane
200 S.Kent
East Wenatchee, WA 98802
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Molly Robertson
1417 brawne ave nw
olympia, WA 98502
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

c: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Larry Franks
24001 SE 103rd St
Issaquah, WA 98027
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Merle Janes, MD
1414 N. Ver lee #3
Spokane Valley, WA 99216
Dear Mr. Scott,

Ya know? This is bad business decision, not to mention racing in the wrong direction for taking care of the planet's (and every living creature's) health. I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous
individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Troy Faith Ward
2827 Nevada ST
Bellingham, WA 98226
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Chuck Rohrer
520 10th Ave E #6
Seattle, WA 98102
2065986241
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Cummings
8520 242nd St SW #307
Edmonds, WA 98026
4259314451
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

First Nations has it right - NO COAL in the PNW!

Sincerely,

kevin orme
502 N 80th
seattle, WA 98103
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tom and Kristi Weir
4639 133rd Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98006
425 747 8480
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gary Albright
21613 Echo Lake Rd
Snohomish, WA 98296

425-881-3048
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Terrie Williams
850 Laura Lane
None
Vidor, TX 77662

4099999999
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

William Hittler
2615 NE 359th Ave
Washougal, WA 98671
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robin Boynton
P.O. Box 1265
Carnation, WA 98014

425-333-6495
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Allycia Godbee
16929 Vaughn Rd .
Cecil, AL 36013

(253) 946-9300
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James Ploger
1909 s charles st
S Charles St
Seattle, WA 98144

2063724212
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Rosie Sharpe
1603 S. Golf Course Rd.
Port Angeles, WA 98362
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ida McCormick
12740 30th NE Apt 535
Apt 535
Seattle, WA 98125
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lozz Starseed
250 washington ave
Old Hall
Seattle, WA 98125
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Vicky Matsui
541 19th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122

206-369-6740
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Arthur Bogie
17423 Snee-oosh RD
La Conner, WA 98257

3608409092
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Steve Serbousek
6885 Holland Road NW
Bremerton, WA 98311

360-613-1328
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly oppose your intention to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities, exposing us to more diesel exhaust, coal dust, more unsafe whistle noise, and damaging vibration.

When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada.

This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project. To date these requests remain unanswered.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.
Sincerely,

Lyn Weick
7631 Westlund Rd
Arlington, WA 98223

425-359-9107
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joan Douglas
6110 93rd PL SW
Mukilteo, WA 98275
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Edward Mills
264 WL Sammamish NE
Bellevue, WA 98008

425-641-4779
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deirdre Morris
P.O. box 553
420 hidden meadows lane
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

6192034313
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Winnie Adams
1305 W Clearbrook Dr #3
Bellingham, WA 98229

360-733-8371
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

William Franklin
4182 Ankar Park Drive
apt 202
Bellingham, WA 98226
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Molly McCabe
9856 NE Torvanger Rd.
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gwen Nakano
9243 S 240th Place
Kent, WA 98030

2538540816
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Donna Davis
338 Viewcrest Rd
Bellingham, WA 98229

(360) 733-6778
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Saab Lofton  
619 Third Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-291-3815
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joel Gibson
402 14th Ave.
Seattle, WA 98122
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Wendy Bartlett
255 N Forest Street #116
Bellingham, WA 98225

(360) 392-0984
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike `Regan
291 horton
Hadlock, WA 98339
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Connor
50 Moore Road
White Salmon, WA 98672

509 493 1080
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Danny Dwinell
1522 NE 175th St., #204
Shoreline, WA 98155
206-466-6289
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

JR Fulton
410 21st Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

206 450-7286
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Erik LaRue
17567 Maiben Rd.
Burlington, WA 98233

3604207871
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stacia Haley
3102 S. Brandon St.
Seattle, WA 98108
2067633852
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Beckie Lindley
1501 Pike Pl #413
Seattle, WA 98101

206-623-4142
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Bachman
102 Panorama Pl
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

360 370 5908
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Watson
13523 248th Ave SE
Issaquah, WA 98027
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Leonard Houghtaling
2643 Queets Avenue
Hoquiam, WA 98550

3604027316
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Damaging the environment in order to ship coal overseas is 100% wrong. Please listen to those who care more for the environment than profit. Coal pollutes and endangers people, animals and the environment.

Sincerely,

Barbara Wilhite
7015 Chico Way N,W.
Bremerton, WA 98312
360 692-8180
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Connie Hess
412 E Novak LN
Kent, WA 98032
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

William Winstanley
4018 Squilchuck Rd.
Wenatchee, WA 98801

509-664-1296
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Garry Nakayama
9243 S 240th Place
Kent, WA 98030

253-854-0816
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

alex abbott
734 14th ave se
olympia, WA 98501
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carol Asmann
756 John Syreet
Apt 508
Seattle, WA 08109
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jackie Cole
13527 Avondale Rd NE
Woodinville, WA 98072

2062769657
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Pynchon
10700 SE 260th St.
G101
Kent, WA 98030

4254952288
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Schuchart
6204 N. Morton
Spokane, WA 99208

509-487-3840
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Sargis
680 Terrace Drive
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

6503476977
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laura Lewis
12305 Ingraham Rd
Snohomish, WA 98290
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fullyscoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Thomas Libbey
PMB 1027 1122 E Pike St
Seattle, WA 98122

3605204204
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michele De Bennedetto
3205 S. University Rd.
Apt. 20
Spokane Valley, WA 99206
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Oralia Miller
9219 191st St. E.
9219 191st street E.
Puyallup, WA 98375

2532622099
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

c: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you're proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ronlyn Schwartz
3648 Davie Lane
Langley, WA 98260

360-221-0706
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Hamer
17227 NE 195th St
Woodinville, WA 98072

2064274317
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susanne Murray
3210 E 44th Ave Apt D304
Spokane, WA 99223
5095650973
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Myong Sevel
2040 nw blue ridge dr
Seattle, WA 98177
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Swanson
9618 41st Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98136

2069374239
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Consuelo Larrabee
1805 Queen Anne Ave N
Seattle, WA 98109

206 281-8677
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port's previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laura Goldberg
9225 N Cedarvale
Arlington, WA 98223

360-435-5455
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Monica Vasquez  
2235 California Ave SW #301  
West Seattle, WA 98116
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tressa Hoekstra
1500 N Warner
Tacoma, WA 98413
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mytzi Rudolph
2221 e st
2221 e st
vancouver, WA 98663

3602566311
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Emily Naftalin

Emily Naftalin
124 11TH AVE E APT 204
SEATTLE, WA 98102
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jerrold Long  
4100 NE 49th Street  
V, WA 98661
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

John Ballard
18008 176th Ave NE
Woodinville, WA 98072
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Ken and Joan Grieser

ken and Joan Grieser
303 S 325th Lane
303 s325th ln
Federal Way, WA 98003

253 517 9640
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
    Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
    Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Allison Ricci
2126 N 86th St
Seattle, WA 98103
3134071048
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Catherine Caron  
323 E Augusta AV  
Spokane, WA 99207
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anand Parikh
19512 80th Ave W Apt B
Edmonds, WA 98026
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Ladely
18305 59th ave SE
Snohomish, WA 98296

206-354-0857
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Katherine Collinson
4182 Ankar Park Drive 201
Bellingham, WA 98226

3607789668
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Max-Jayde Romero
8008 Stroud Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103

206.734.5405
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Hinckley-Porter
1972 New Manx lane
Poulsbo, WA 98370
Dear Mr. Scott,

You have received a detailed letter from the Washington Environmental Council concerning opposition to a coal export terminal in Vancouver BC. I agree with their statements, and I ask you to do all you can to prevent the development of a coal export terminal in your jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

Frank Turner
Olympia, WA, USA

360-878-8182
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Diana Nielsen
15209 Wallingford Ave N.
Shoreline, WA 98133

206-361-4510
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

J.A. Jennings
2324 NE 28th St.
Renton, WA 98056
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Walter Hunner
55203 Bay Area Dr NE
ELECTRIC CITY, WA 99123
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

stephen shubert
61 Sutherland Rd
Friday Harbor, WA 98250
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Siptroth
2160 E Trails End Dr.
Belfair, WA 98528
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Amy Loken
7060 Lincoln Park Way SW, #202
Seattle, WA 98136
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Acker
nw 138th
Vancouver, WA 98685
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barry Maxwell
8408 7th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98106
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brie Gyncild
1407 15th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Caryn Gayfield, Registered Nurse, retired

Caryn Gayfield
301 Sid Snyder Dr. #105
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon Kaylen
14778 Sivertson Rd
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

2068428031
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Victoria Urias
14001 35th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98125
2063676959
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dawn Spickler
406 S Coeur d'Alene St apt A
Spokane, WA 99201
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and "GLOBAL WARMING" and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

THERE IS NO DOUBT ANY MORE THAT BURNING COAL AND OTHER CARBON PRODUCTS ARE THE CAUSE OF GLOBAL WARMING. IF THIS PLANET IS TO SURVIVE, WE MUST STOP BURNING CARBON FOR ENERGY! ALREADY MANY SPECIS ARE EXTINCT, AND WE ARE HEADING AS FAST AS WE CAN TO MAKE SURE THAT LIFE ON EARTH GOES EXTINCT!

THE DEVESTATION FROM OPEN PIT MINES IS ANOTHER GRAVE CONCERN. THE POLLUTION FROM BURNING COAL IN CHINA DRIFTS OUR WAY, AND AFFECT OUR HEALTH. ALLREADY MANY ARE DYING FROM AIR POLLUTION, INCLUDING UNEXPLAINED CANCERS, ETC.
Sincerely,

Mr. Chuck Hanna-Myrick  
22525 39th Ave SE  
Bothell, WA 98021  

206-276-7706
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

cathy miler
20308-17th Ave NW
Shoreline, WA 98177

206-542-0364
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jeannine Lish
17729 25th Ave NE
Marysville, WA 98271

360 652-9227
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Florence Harty
1130 NW Baker Drive
White Salmon, WA 98672

5613021950
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jean Crane
24700 Taka Ln NE
Kingston, WA 98346
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hillary Tiefer
15703 Boones Way
Lake Oswego, OR 97035

5036361048
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ernetta Skerlec
6801 77th St W
Lakewood, WA 98499

253-584-1540
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

George Keefe
960 5th Avenue South
#203
Edmonds, WA 98020

4255827146
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Olson
PO box 102
Vancouver, WA 98685

360 571 5324
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Peter Rimbos
19711 241st Ave SE
Maple Valley, WA 98038

(425) 432-1332
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Greg Puppione
563 Kamoku St. A-5
Honolulu, HI 96826

8089453455
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lorinda Roland
P.O. Box 55
Olga, WA 98279

360-376-6880
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Ireland
28606 41st ave s
auburn, WA 98001
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Blumenthal
2812 NE 62nd St.
Seattle, WA 98115
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dwight Johnson
424 W Bakerview Rd, 105-228
Bellingham, WA 98226
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway."

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bob Eugene
121 Woodard Rd
Newport, WA 99156
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Keiko Okada
787 Maynard Ave S
Seattle, WA 98104
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Daniel Brant
310 willow st.
Port Townsend, WA 98368

3603854881
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Sanford
27007 NE 19th St
Camas, WA 98607
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

LISA KELSEY
10746 TRACIE CT.S.W.
OLYMPIA, WA 98512
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gary Chamberlain
6529 44th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98115
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Chasity Hungerford
4075 Aeriel Way #218
Eugene, OR 97402

425-522-4797
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah McCoy
1226 Rucker Ave
Everett, WA 98201
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joan Robbins
Hudson
Seattle, WA 98118
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Szumlas
3815 s. court st.
Seattle, WA 98144

206-723-5992
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joan Peter
5805 98th Ave. NW
GIG HARBOR, WA 98335

2537223337
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laurel Hughes
8814 236th St SW
Apt 23
Edmonds, WA 98026

206-437-4421
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gary Pierson
126 I ST.SE
a, WA 98002
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jane Nelson-Low
719 W. Montgomery Ave.
Spokane, WA 99205

509-475-2971
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly disagree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site. This is a great idea.

There is little, just George Soros a criminal, opposition to your project.

We are deeply concerned how you are being mislead, this attempt to manipulate the energy market to benefit a Billionaire is disgusting. I trust Canada will make it safe to transport coal since there has NEVER been an issue.

There is a future in exporting thermal coal.

The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group and George Soros, that should say a lot.

I do not share their concerns about coal and climate change (A misnomer as dictated by Karl Marx.) We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, so we urge you to continue plans for this coal port and seek to expose George Soros attempt at manipulating the energy Market

The info against your plan is mostly funded by George Soros who is trying to bring down coal stock, so he can buy more of it, then you wont see these crazy petitions as he will want you to export coal. He is buying coal stock as we speak.

Sincerely,
Sal Miller
1100 Pike Street
Seattle, WA 98122
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

P. Perron
Seaview
Seattle, WA 98117

4254661275
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ms Diane Weyer
12025 Marine Dr #331
Tulalip, WA 98271

3609829360
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Janet Alderton
PO Box 352
491 Harborview Lane
Deer Harbor, WA 98243

360-376-3905
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Aisha Farhoud
4750 16TH AVE NE
SEATTLE, WA 98105
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Clark
5517 S Helena Lane
Spokane, WA 99223
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Clark
5517 S Helena Lane
Spokane, WA 99223
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

gretchen carlson
1300 114th Ave SE
#102
Bellevue, WA 98004

425-454-2835
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Eugene Thorne
5646 South Warner Street
Tacoma, WA 98409
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Margie Jensen
825 196th St. NW
Arlington, WA 98223
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ellen Posel
2315 J St.
Bellingham, WA 98225

3606765194
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Angela Perstein
3306 E Terrace St
Seattle, WA 98122

2066189092
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jon Houghton
9636 Blake Pl
Edmonds,, WA 98020
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brian Huseby
521 North 7th Ave.
Tumwater, WA 98512
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Rosemarie Wiegman
6513 E. B St.
Tacoma, WA 98404
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Debbie Bremner
15837 11th Ave NE
Shoreline, WA 98155

(206)744-2619
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and have traveled extensively in British Columbia, so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full
public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Greg Wingard
PO Box 4051
Seattle, WA 98194

253-639-7245
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I live in Port Townsend, WA, U.S.A., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full
public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jeff Randall

Jeff Randall
1142 Adams St.
Port Townsend, WA 98368
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Flowers
5232 Broadview Rd.
Richfield, OH 44286
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

ronnie mitchell
401 W. CHAMPION ST.
401 w. champion st. #301
bellingham, WA 98225

3607521183
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Katherine Scott
11330 Whistle Lake Road
Anacortes, WA 98221, WA 98221

(360) 293-6452
Fraser Surrey Docks
Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sheila Brown
19834 Vashon Highway SW
Vashon, WA 98070

206 463-0811
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

beth derooy
13039 3rd ave ne
seattle, WA 98125

206-364-3695
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ellen McKinley
3826 80th Avenue SE
Olympia, WA 98501
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

melody rae
9601 el camino lane se
yelm, WA 98597
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

mary wickwire
1416 E Roy
seattle, WA 98112
2043221219
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lisa Guyll
3127 aladdin rd
Colville, WA 99114
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anna Kristín Hauksdottir
21088 88th PL W
Edmonds, WA 98026
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Patricia Ellerby
15955 Lemolo
Poulsbo, WA 98370

3607795470
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Rory Denovan
3213 SW 114th St
Seattle, WA 98146

206-529-7221
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Richard Kennedy
18825 6th Ave SW
Normandy Park, WA 98166
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cady Moris
10701 NE 65th Lane
Kirkland, WA 98033
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Birgit Llewellyn
521 E Anderson Rd
Sequim, WA 98382
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lew Sikes
E 281 Lombard Rd N/box 122
Grapeview, WA 98546

3602755649
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Karen Snow
1524 Ridge View Dr
Cheney, WA 99004
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Leonard Knoll
805 9th St.
Benton City, WA 99320
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully Scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

I sherwood
1 pine
bham, WA 98229
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway."

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

William O’Brien
12520 SW Gem Lane #202
Beaverton, OR 97005

5036795194
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jerry Beene
1410 W Casino Rd
B-16
Everett, WA 98204
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joy Gohl
725 Snowden Rd
White Salmon, WA 98672

509-493-8555
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cliff Hansen
15901 121st Ave KPN
Gig Harbor, WA 98329
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brian Baltin
500 13th Ave. East #107
Seattle, WA 98102

2063285667
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marley Arborico, Student, 19

Marley Arborico
1220 10th ave east
Seattle, WA 98102
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

R S McClain
3610 33rd Ave S #402
Seattle, WA 98144
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fullyScoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lynn Johanna
2198 98th Ave South
Kent, WA 98031
I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joanne Peterson
7465 Skagit View Drive
Concrete, WA 98237
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Julie Day
307 19th Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ann El-Moslimany
PO Box 367
Seahurst, WA 98062
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH SLOSS
2228 40th Ave East
Seattle, WA 98112
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Rosenkotter
201 Crest Drive
Box 136
Deer Harbor, WA 98243

360-370-7676
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christian and Lea Andrade
146 Starlight Way
Friday Harbor, WA 98250
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from Washington State, and I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below and the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kara Whittaker
2818 SW 115th St
Burien, WA 98146

2069353844
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Janice Gonzales
13725 32nd Ave NE
Apt A208
Seattle, WA 98125
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kevin Darcy
3140 Adams Ave. #C304
Bellingham, WA 98225

3609209017
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from Seattle, Washington, and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full
public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Peara
13039 8th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98177
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

daniel polley
6201 N. Wayne
chicago, IL 60660
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

BRIAN MATHEWS
347NW 200TH ST
optional
SHORELINE, WA 98177

2065468090
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brianna Kohlenberg
15217 63rd St Ct E
Sumner, WA 98390
206-459-4833
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lin Provost
3707 42nd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98144

2067231026
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jean Whitesavage
5152 Mutiny Bay Road
Freeland, WA 98249
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

shemayim elohim
213 32nd Ave
Seattle, WA 98122
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

diane crummett
12 dogwood st so
p.o. box 1047
soap lake, WA 98851

5092467048
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sherry Bupp
8208 161st Ave NE, Apt A403
Redmond, WA 98052
425.891.9635
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kiwibob Glanzman
1220 NE 90th
Seattle, WA 98115

206-555-1212
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
    Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
    Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ruth Tooley
150 E. Fairfield Ct.
Shelton, WA 98584
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

raymond baigas
2000 alaskan way #344
Seattle, WA 98121
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Dickey
13911 13th gr. S.E. #L
Mill Creek, WA 98012
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Theodore Dodge
12822 NE 68th St.
Kirkland, WA 98033
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

William Belknap
629 Don Vincente Dr
Boulder City, NV 89005

7022936011
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Beverly Anderson
309 Tamarack
Goldendale, WA 98620

509-773-3135
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Scarlett Caldwell
6190 Terrace View LN SE
Auburn, WA 98092
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Steve Wilson
PO Box 4035
West Richland, WA 99353

800-891-6607
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Diane Tait Dong
13700 Avon Allen Road
Avon Dale Farm
Mount Vernon, WA 98273
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Biale
7711 Greenridge St SW
Olympia, WA 98512

360-754-7727
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy White
13311 E Forrest Ave
Spokane Valley, WA 99216

509-922-3855
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Prestage
11612 428th Ave SE
North Bend, WA 98045
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Adrian Vetter
4544 7th Ave. N.E. #410
Seattle, WA 98105

425-306-4941
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Wyman
4225 Forest Beach Dr. NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98335
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sandra F. Wilsn
POB 2209
Friday Harbor, WA 98250
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nick Gillett
Indian
Bellingham, WA 98225
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Wheeler
317 E 4th Street
Deer Park, WA 99006
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dylan Simpson
213 Carolina St
Bellingham, WA 98225
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carlo Voli
9605 239th st sw
Edmonds, WA 98020

2069927474
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mindi Tambellini
11054 17th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98146
2063722334
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sherry McCabe
4821 Sunrise Beach Rd.
Olympia, WA 98502
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Esther Wolf
5433 Leary Ave. N.W.
Seattle, WA 98107
206 284 3429
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Avinger
2638 E Smith Rd
Bellingham, WA 98226
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Ellingham
9106 Fortuna Drive, Apt. 4201
Mercer Island, WA 98040
425-746-5205
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Donna Merlina
704 Willow Ct. S
Bellingham, WA 98225
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Clean Power is are ONLY FUTURE what does it take to wake all of you UP We have ONLY ONE EARTH

Sincerely,

g g
4 i
orting, WA 98360
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Clay
2612 Utter St.
Bellingham, WA 98225

360 6500963
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Pamela Gray
104 1st Street
Cheney, WA 99004
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Y.
308 4th Ave. S.
Seattle, WA 98104
2062258627
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Boatsman
3210 74th AVE SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040

206-595-8579
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tara Leigh
1600B SW Dash Point Rd
Federal Way, WA 98023
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Desireenna Hutchinson
234 Logan Hill Road
Chehalis, WA 98532

3606744574
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Diane BETTGER
7228 4th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

2067849502
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Clayton Conway
107 Pine St
Seattle, WA 98101
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dick Jacke
9411 177th Pl NE Unit 1
Redmond, WA 98052

425-869-8306
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tess Morgan
4701 SW admiral way 71
Seattle, WA 98116

206 937 2424
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Stone
525 ne 92 st
Seattle, WA 98115
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Danielle Rowland
1654 153rd Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98007

425-746-0167
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jennifef Rhyne
11511 82nd Ave Ct E
Puyallup, WA 98373

2532294304
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Karen Howard
8447 Moonglow Court
Blaine, WA 98230

3603713127
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Johnson
3319 W. 23rd Ave.
Spokane, WA 99224
Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Schetzer
1134 Finnegan Way #305
Bellingham, WA 98225

3607332764
Dear Mr. Scott,

Last week I backpacked in our National forests. It was drier than I have ever seen it with rivers at all time lows. The air was hazy from the thousands of acres that are burning throughout our state. The city I grew up in (Seattle) is experiencing critically low water levels in it’s reservoirs. It has been the hottest, driest summer on record. When you leave the imagined safety of buildings and spend time living out in nature you become very aware of how quickly things can go sideways. Do not be hypnotized by illusions of safety. Do the right things to protect our one and only planet

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.
• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.
Sincerely,

Cheryl Lawrence
348 High St
Freeland, WA 98249
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Travis Miller
3114 E Pine St
Seattle, WA 98122
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Sielaff
3827 Bagley Ave. N
Seattle, WA 98103

206-675-8090
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kelly O'Hanley
6134 NE Alameda Street
Portland, OR 97213

5038808844
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tim Foster
3163 W. Daisy Ave.
Spokane, WA 99205
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Holly Harris
2850 McKenzie Avenue
Bellingham, WA 98225
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kristi Damour
1012 park drive
Everett, WA 98203
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon Wilson
retired environmental engineer
3240 NE 96th St
Seattle, WA 98115

2065225971
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Don Ferkingstad
6003 35th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98107
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ernst R. Strahm
173 S. E. Street
Bellevue, WA 98006
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

C W
XX XXX
Seattle, WA 98125
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase Freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Friday
7519 NE 204th Place
Kenmore, WA 98028
4254882799
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Beth Call
102 Otis
Walla Walla, WA 99362

509-529-0216
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Eric Fosburgh
1415 E Republican St #203
Seattle, WA 98112

206-409-7535
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Chris Watson
7965 Kendall rd.
P.O. Box 1893
Maple Falls,, WA 98266

360 599 2837
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Julia Briggs
6528 60th St SE
Snohomish, WA 98290

425-335-1359
 Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dennie Carcelli
15626-B 8th Ave. SW
Burien, WA 98166
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Heather van Helvoort
2310 Shoreland Dr S
Seattle, WA 98144

3472482044
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase Freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dorje Bellbrook
529 n 77th st
Seattle, WA 98103
2063215350
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Maxine Dunkelman
5418 Lemon RD NE
Olympia, WA 98506
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carol Rolf
679 1/2 N. Maple St.
Colville, WA 99114

509-684-2326
Fraser Surrey Docks
Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks; Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester; Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Betz
2630 Franklin
Bellingham, WA 98225
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Dawson
PO Box 562
Port Hadlock, WA 98339
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hal Glidden
419 Briar Rd
Bellingham, WA 98225

360-778-3583
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hollis Higgins
427 W. Cleveland
Spokane, WA 99205
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Lavelle
7050 12th ave. NW
Seattle, WA 98117
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Kemper
905 Lake St. S., #103N
Kirkland, WA 98033

(425) 827-3530
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

MALCOLM AW
4518, 146th AVE S.E.
BELLEVUE, WA 98006
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometers long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brueckner
403 Cedar Avenue
Port Hadlock, WA 98339
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Heather Chapin
7126 N Interstate Ave
Portland, OR 97217

503-952-6279
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Riff Millar
1806 12th Ave
B402
Seattle, WA 98122

4255222295
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

PS Clean energy, now!! Thank you.

Sincerely,

Randi Pewzner
PO Box 95624
Seattle, WA 98145
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Emily Van Alyne
6749 Whitestone Street
West Richland, WA 99353

3023551722
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

John Seeburger
8 Lakeside Country Club SW
Lakewood, WA 98498
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Holly Gwinn-Graham
5900 Brenner Rd NW
Olympia, WA 98502
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ann Lazaroff
2720 171st St SE
Bothell, WA 98012
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mitka Crooks
4375 Palomino Drive NE
Bainbridge, WA 98110
Fraser Surrey Docks

I'm a Canadian citizen living in Seattle WA, and for both my nations I ask that this port not be built.

Gordon Adams, Box 15268, Seattle, WA 98115

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.
We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gordon Adams
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alice Tobias
3616 42nd Str
Seatle, WA 98105

(651) 235-0983
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

lisa lybarger
209 confer rd
kalama, WA 98625
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

E. Johnston
2418 Aloha St.
Seattle, WA 98112

206-407-5003
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Moritz
6001 24th Ave. NW #402
#402
Seattle, WA 98107
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anne Elkins
2006 N Ave
Anacortes, WA 98221

360-293-5256
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Rodney Herold
3317 South Hanford Street
Seattle, WA 98144
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kate McClure
217 E St. SW
Auburn, WA 98001

253-804-4408
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dr. Darlene Townsend
2803 East 11th Ave.
Spokane, WA 99202

000 000 0000
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Raymond Gill
200 217th Pl SW
Bothell, WA 98021
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Arnn
776 Landis Lane
Port Townsend, WA 98368

360-344-3963
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kurt Fickeisen
13024 37th Ave. NE
13024 37th Ave NE
SEATTLE, WA 98125

2063640525
Dear Jeoff Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jean Berolzheimer
311 N 160th Place
Shoreline, WA 98133

2063076674
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sergey Galushko
5515 156TH ST SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

(425)741-9057
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David L. Edwards
1607 East Bay Drive
Olympia, WA 98506

360-866-7165
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard and Mrs. Donna Alvey
2900 Colonial Dr.
Centralia, WA 98531

360-736-1540
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Margaret Bergmann-Ness
2502 N 40th St
Seattle, WA 98103
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Gregory
3538 NE 86TH ST
SINGLE_FAMILY_HOME
SEATTLE, WA 98115
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Holly Homan
755 n 165th st
shoreline, WA 98133
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kelley Slack
1811 34th Street
Bellingham, WA 98229
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gordon Wood
906 Lake Washington Blvd South
Seattle, WA 98144

(206) 851-0141
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Savage
9805 Johnson Point Loop NE
Olympia, WA 98516
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Eileen McCabe
2201 192nd St SE
#P3
Bothell, WA 98012
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Soltis  
3103 E. 19th Ave.  
Spokane, WA 9923
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lauren Tozzi
4648 Sunnyside Ave N.
Seattle, WA 98103
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nora Ferm
19 Aloha St
Apt 7
Seattle, WA 98109

2065561830
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S. I am strongly in agreement with the May 10th letter below and with the concerned Canadians who are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

S. Jacky
2411 Lexington St
Steilacoom, WA 98388

2535888902
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

DAWN SKINDZIEL
PO Box 12116
MILL CREEK, WA 98082

425.760.4977
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Diane Hetrick
7020 18 ave SW
F12
Seattle, WA 98106
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Mayers
1907 161 Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98008
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Larry Karns
614 NW 180th Street
Shoreline, WA 98177

2064371382
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Karen Bachelder
2119 NE 81st St
Seattle, WA 98115

206-525-4580
I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jim & Jan Rettig
7232 Marwood Place
Woodinville, WA 98072

425 4021833
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Taryn JOEL
2425 Sw Webster St
Seattle, WA 98106

206-478-5736
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Eccles
2772 Abraham
Spokane, WA 99230
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sally Neary
22608 115th Pl SE
Kent, WA 98031
Fraser Surrey Docks
Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Melanie Kenoyer
708 W 24th St
Vancouver, WA 98660

3606956095
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Grace Hutson-Miller
2515 Colby Ave
415
Everett, WA 98201
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

lydia garvey
429 s 24th st
clinton, OK 73601

5803232327
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Alvarez
5629 Kuhn Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

360 379-0330
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

john eschen
308 E St
grand coulee, WA 99133

5096338129
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

T J Thompson
PO Box 1178
Gig Harbor, WA 98335
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Keeler
1102 NW 83rd Street
Seattle, WA 98117

206 784-4267
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Keeler
1102 NW 83rd Street
Seattle, WA 98117

206 784-4267
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Luther E. Franklin
19510 SE May Valley Rd.
issaquah, WA 98027

(425) 204-0641
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

mary n
38th st
Vancouver, WA 98683
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Syd Potter
6732 Alder Glen Drive SE
Olympia, WA 98513

3607861351
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Don Kunze
521 5th Ave. W. #701
Seattle, WA 98119
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Caton
20811 N Macs Loop Rd
Apt 4B4
Granite Falls, WA 98252

4253596638
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

R. A. Larson
109 S 27th Street
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

360-280-7396
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency, the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dennis Rea
1400 Hubbell Place
Seattle, WA 98101
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Edward Colley
2540 Robbins Road
Ellensburg, WA 98926

5098527246
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Bell
21507 42nd Ave S
Seatac, WA 98198

2062277062
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Perret
2397 Sand Dollar Rd. W
Bremerton, WA 98312
Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lory Garrett
noneya
Port Angeles, WA 98363
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sally Mackey
2127 SW 162
Burien, WA 98166

206 243 3338
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elena Rumiantseva
Paralegal
310 N 46th St., Apt. 103
Apt 103
Seattle, WA 98103
2067891408
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christopher Lawrence
19 East 32nd Avenue
Spokane, WA 99203

509-624-9639
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Les Heffler
17906 SE 24th Street
Vancouver, WA 98683

(360) 882-1676
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jack Frymire
5877 Laurel Ridge Way
Bellingham, WA 98226

360 398-2484
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Willie Edwards
1619 S 73rd Street
Tacoma, WA 98408

2534746832
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Hilarie Ericson
1020 NE 63RD St
#301
Seattle, WA 98115

2063101053
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sandra Carr
22910 90th Ave W, D402
Edmonds, WA 98026
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Daniel Hill
7526 NE 204th Pl
Kenmore, WA 98028

4257611341
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Sebek
331 N. 78th
Greenwood Ave. N.
Seattle, WA 98103

2067068268
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

blayney myers
242 Shaddox Springs Rd
underwood, WA 98651

5094932637
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

scott mobus
1305 NE 43rd St
Apt 7
Seattle, WA 98105
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gary Bowers
1436 Toledo st
Bellingham, WA 98229

360-676-4460
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Toni Howard
12841 SE 175th Ct
Renton, WA 98058
2064128664
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Stephens
14016 129th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98034
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Thompsen
18425 NE 95th St. #201, Redmond, WA
Redmond, WA 98052

4257619028
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Craig feyk
9705 236th pl sw
edmonds, WA 98020

206-546-4866
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

elaine brouwer
6592 fletcher bay rd ne
optional
bainbridge Is, WA 98110

2065221632
I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marianne Edain
Box 53
Langley, WA 98260

360-579-4080
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jim Popper
44201 Fir Rd
Gold Bar, WA 98251

3607933559
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mix
PO Box 2456
Kirkland, WA 98083

425-827-8137
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laurie Levy
2402 Delmar Dr. E.
Seattle, WA 98102
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scooped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Patricia Newton
97 S Douglas St
Cashmere, WA 98815
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jerry Kessinger
6727 Willow
Everett, WA 98203

2063728515
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Rae Leatham
241 Corvus Ln
Port Ludlow, WA 98365
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Corinne Dooley-Dedon
26413 NE Barrett Rd.
Kingston, WA 98346
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Strobele
15115 NE 67th Pl
Redmond, WA 98052
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ellen Kissman
1143 NW 58th
Seattle, WA 98107

206 781-9468
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ellen Knowlen
7734 161st St Ct E
Puyallup, WA 98375
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Wendy Tanowitz
3218 41st Way NW
olympia, WA 98502
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

For the sake of our children and grandchildren leave the coal in the ground and don't build another port to cause more global warming.

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous
individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

charlene canonica
11806 marine vw dr sw
burien, WA 98146
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Feletar
804 SE 99th Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98664

3609752206
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Andronetta Douglass
255 W Bakerview Rd, #105
Bellingham, WA 98226

(360) 392-8782
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lindell Haggin
15418 N. Little Spokane Dr.
Spokane, WA 99208

509 466-4118
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Leeper
4742 - 42nd Ave. SW, PMB 379
Seattle, WA 98116

206-419-1836
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Carr
119 E 17th Ave
Spokane, WA 99203

509-747-3264
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dan Albright
14611 S.E. 19th PL
Bellevue, WA 98007
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Liz Gaspar
161 E Heron Cv
Shelton, WA 98584

360 432-3692
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cami Cameron  
1521 X Street  
Vancouver , WA 98661  
2607187093
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Pauline Druffel
930 S Cannon St #13
apt 13
Spokane, WA 99204

509-624-2127
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lisa Tenney
2613 Peabody st
Bellingham, WA 98225
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Toni Schwellinger
4465 victory pl sw
Port orchard , WA 98367
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fullyScoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Heather Hall
5312 Keystone PL N
Seattle, WA 98028

2062716929
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stephen Morrissey
15204 103rd Ave NE
Bothell, WA 98011
(425) 908-7688
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judith Schwab
9142 N. Mercer Way, Apt. 7203
Mercer Island, WA 98040
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Philip R. Ronco
102 Fifth Avenue
Apt # 5-304
Milton, WA 98354
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scope
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Teresa Lyman
25810 160th Ave SE
Covington , WA 98042
253-709-0913
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Scott Brown
NW Market St
Seattle, WA 98107
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Oleksii Bilous
2131 52nd Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98116
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

ElsaMarie Butler
627 W. Titus St
Kent, WA 98032

253 850 0948
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jason Lim
620 N 34 street Apt 218
Apt. 218
Seattle, WA 98103

2488953979
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Thomas Cox
11682 Holmes Pt Dr NE
Kirkland, WA 98034

42582335683
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Amanda Moyle
14014 NE 78th CT
Redmond, WA 98052
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gregory Loomis
8330 13th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

206-789-6778
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James Allen
2020 Stevens
Shelton, WA 98584

3604900356
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jackie Dern
9708 116th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Justin Morgan
10223 NE 21st Place
Bellevue, WA 98004
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Betsy Pappas
926 W. Alder Ct.
Washougal, WA 98671
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Halpern
1121 Vista Del Mar Drive
Sequim, WA 98382

360-554-45444
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Taryn JOEL
2425 Sw Webster St
Seattle, WA 98106

206-478-5736
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah Gandolfo
127 10th Ave
Kirkland, WA 98033
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cornelia Shearer
Auburn Way S
Auburn, WA 98092
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Evelyn McChesney
2991 NE Blakeley St. # 208
Seattle, WA 98105

2065253984
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Claire Morency
4918 NE 144th Ct
Vancouver, WA 98682

360-253-3904
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Spruce Schoenemann
5618 4th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98107
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christine Armond
POB 2326
Shelton, WA 98584

000 000 0000
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

If you have any doubts about climate change and the rapidity it is causing melting of glaciers please watch the 1 hr 15 min documentary "Chasing Ice."

Sincerely,

John Countryman
15810 143rd Ave SE
Yelm, WA 98597
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gale Davis
3006 44th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98199

206-286-8107
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Glickman
pobox 1542
nyc, NY 10035
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Maria Magana
1290 Hillcrest Drive
Burlington, WA 98233

3603337015
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2  

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt  

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Matthew Heitzenroder
901 Jersey St
Bellingham, WA 98225
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jim Mathrusse
1322 Bellevue Way SE
Bellevue, WA 98004
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon McWillis
2038 Porta Ct NW
Olympia, WA 98502

360-528-7397
Dear Mr. Scott,

MAN HAS BEEN BURNING THINGS TO MAKE HEAT FOR TENS OF THOUSANDS OF YEARS, AND IT IS LONG PAST TIME FOR US TO WAKE UP TO REALITY, AND RECOGNIZE THAT WE HAVE A VIRTUALLY INFINITE SOURCE OF HEAT ABOVE US AS WELL AS BELOW US!!!

STOP THE BURNING!!! IT IS KILLING LIFE ON OUR PLANET!

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you're proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills
and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Stephen Bailey
edward dr
deming, WA 98244

206-890-0476
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael von Sacher-Masoch
PO Box 5273
Everett, WA 98206

(555) 555-5555
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Barr
5249 Rain Drop Ln.
Freeland, WA 98249
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Beth Eisenbeis
18030 25th Dr SE
Bothell, WA 98012
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

david Pate
5066 Bayview Rd
Langley, WA 98260
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Wood
12507 Greenwood Ave., North,
A402
Seattle, WA 98133

2069499264
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Heather Van Vorous
80 S Washington St #304
Seattle, WA 98104

2063833220
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Goerke
20809 prairie rd
sedro Woolley, WA 98284
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Charles Sheaffer
51 Holly Circle
Port Angeles, WA 98362

(360) 452-5688
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Goerke
20809 prairie rd
sedro Woolley, WA 98284
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Teresa O'Connor
6232 Palatine Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98103

206.789.2545
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Steve Uyenishi
12425 74th Ln. S. #24
Seattle, WA 98178
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway."

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ardeth L. Weed
520 HEMLOCK WAY APT 4
EDMONDS, WA 98020

(425) 582-8676
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

neil hammond
124 n 103rd st #210
Seattle, WA 98119
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susanne Hartwell
PO box 10308
Spokane, WA 99209
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and I am writing to say that I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below. I am in agreement with the concerned Canadians who are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full
public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals are granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river that would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Patricia Warden
8848 129th Place SE
Newcastle, WA 98056

425.277.4079
I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Wood
2719 - 93rd Ave NE
Clyde Hill, WA 98004

425-454-4641
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

gene ankli
3114 n. 20th #3
3
Tacoma, WA 98406
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Diana Pratt
1011 E Sharpsburg AVE
Apt 514
Spokane, WA 99208
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sandra Shipley
5445 Langley Rd
Langley, WA 98260

513-675-1366
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

dennis Olson
23333 14th ave. s
Des Moines, WA 98198
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway."

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Essie Hicks
164 Capella Ct NW
Issaquah, WA 98027
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jan Cunningham
14315 103rd Ave. NE
Kirkland, WA 98034
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

christine mustelier
900 32nd ave
seattle, WA 98122
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

William Beers
1830 Rosewood Lane
Bellingham, WA 98225

401 338 1380
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sheri Staley
6052 E Pickering Rd
Shelton, WA 98584
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christopher Key
1571 H Street #201
201
Bellingham, WA 98225

360-778-1002
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gail Lassman
4012 32nd Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98199

2062821243
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Smith
1415 8th St
Clarkston, WA 99403

509 758-8886
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kristine Moore
4105 Soundview Dr. W.
University Place, WA 98466

16617946154
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Leave coal behind & start investing in AE! Alternative Energy!

Sincerely,

Randy Harrison

Randy Harrison
201 Camas St
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Vicki Hanauer
7026 46th Ln SE
Olympia, WA 98503
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kim Figlar-Barnes
PO Box 1946
Elma, WA 98541
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ronald Snell
14222 108th Ave NE
14222 108th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98034

4258145698
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

John Niendorf
508 Kelsando
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

2535768661
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alex Mach
9242 Woodlawn Ave.N.
unit b
Seattle, WA 98103

(206) 913-8484
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nikki Beard
5871 S. 152nd st
Tukwila, WA 98188
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase FREIGHTER traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gary Dering
5507 Huntwick Dr. NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

2532790441
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase.freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joel Carlson
3634 Loren St NE
Lacey, WA 98516

2535492962
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Fred Sayer
14012 SW Pohl Rd
Vashon, WA 98070
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marcia Patton
409 Third Avenue South SteA
Kent, WA 98032
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Talia Haller
18903 SE 19th
Vancouver, WA 98683

3602598227
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Geneva Blake
520 Linden Rd
Bellingham, WA 98225
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Cunningham
1746 NW 57 St. #402
Seattle, WA 98107

000-000-0000
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cecilie Davidson
1181 Corcan Rd
Qualicum Beach, BC V9K 2R6
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Maureen Steber
302 Osprey Lane
Brinnon, WA 98320
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robin Miller
5529 Kinney Rd SW
Olympia, WA 98512

3607053263
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Gabriel
3125C 36th Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

3604890131
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Meghan McCutcheon
215 NW Country Pl Dr.
White Salmon, WA 98672

5555555555
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tod Braunwart
8912 NE 30th Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98665

360-314-5353
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jean Teach
3708 E. Evergreen Blvd.
Vancouver, WA 98661

3606949753
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dave McKee
P.O. Box 53
Post Office Box 53
Port Angeles, WA 98362
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joseph Santana
1905 Sw 350th st
Federal Way, WA 98023
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mayellen Henry
16651 SE 17th St
Bellevue, WA 98008

425-746-5959
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gene Lawson
4615 191st. St. S.W.
Lynnwood, WA 98036

425-776-8926
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gene Lawson
4615 191st. St. S.W.
Lynnwood, WA 98036

425-776-8926
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gene Lawson
4615 191st. St. S.W.
Lynnwood, WA 98036

425-776-8926
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jack Burke
15944 259th Ave SE
Issaquah, WA 98027
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary-Ann Kirsling
P.O. Box 3063
Pasco, WA 99302
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increasefreighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Mitten-Lewis
913 W Pacificview Dr
Bellingham, WA 98229

3607335745
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ingrid Berge
3920 S 301st Pl
Auburn, WA 98001
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Vicky Stamolis
9620 29th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

2067813030
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jordan Awasthi
2020 Grant Ave S
Renton, WA 98055
2062836388
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jo Harvey
204 Eastgate Ave N
Pacific, WA 98047

2532219775
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Chelsa Wojciakowski
2820 15th Ave W
Seattle, WA 98119
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jaci LeGore Hodgins
19 N. Davies Rd
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deanna Glass
9615 Holly Dr.
Everett, WA 98204
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Dowson
2007 Millpointe Drive SE
Mill Creek, WA 98012
425 338-1787
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Humphrey
PO Box 527
Grapeview, WA 98546
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Scott Yoos
4500 Martin Way E; Spc. #35
Spc. #35
Olympia, WA 98516

999 999 9999
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susie Saalwaechter
3803 155TH AVE SE
BELLEVUE, WA 98006
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Megan Smith
1352 yakima ave s
seattle, WA 98144
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scope...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Ellis
5405 N Vista Grande Drive
Otis Orchards, WA 99027

5099278003
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Doug Brown
5405 N Vista Grande Dr
Otis Orchards, WA 99027

5099278003
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Amy Heyneman
10579 NE Manor Lane
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

2067801202
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Chapline
8110 55th Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98513
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dr. Scott,

I am from the U.S. and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the sixth largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Francie Rutherford
1815 E. McGraw St
Seattle, WA 98112
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joe Mabel
3164 NE 83rd Street
Seattle, WA 98115
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Pam Borso
P O Box 154
2940 Arnie Rd
Custer, WA 98240

3603199004
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

anthony long
4111 Englewood Ave
Yakima, WA 98908
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
    Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
    Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lynne Bannerman
4800 Fremont
Seattle, WA 98103

555-555-5555
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

sharon tate
P.O. Box 421
Preston, WA 98050
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Janet Pinneo
530 Mt Park Blvd SW
Issaquah, WA 98027

425-837-4615
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cameron McElroy
6328 119th Street East,
Puyallup,, WA 98373
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joyce Altaras
1508 n lake Stickney dr.
Lynnwood, WA 98087
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bill Leyrer  
1200 Westlake Ave N. suite 310  
apt 4D  
Seattle, WA 98109  

(206) 505-9429
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

c: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tarsands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

ken Crawbuck
37 Blue Camas Lane
Friday Harbor, WA 98250
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ray Redd
10121 Evergreen Way
#25-426
Everett, WA 98204
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Voss
7001 NE 137th St.
Kirkland, WA 98034
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Pfeiler
448 Sunwood Dr NW
Salem, OR 97304

5035880543
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sally Sheck
316 W Barrett St
Seattle, WA 98119
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Parker
PO Box 65
Oysterville, WA 98641

360/665-5077
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Teresa Allen
6184 North Fork Rd.
Deming, WA 98244

360-592-4208
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sarah Collmer
704 W 20 St.
Vancouver, WA 98660

360-735-1652
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lauren Tozzi
4648 Sunnyside Avenue N.
Seattle, WA 98103

2065475107
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. TheMusqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alfredo Quarto
4872 Deer Park Rd.
Port Angeles, WA 98362
360-452-5866
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jim Erckmann
26 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

4258276595
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ronda Snider
13805 Easy Street Kp N
Gig Harbor, WA 98329

253-884-6916
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sybille Vital
206 Easy St. SE
Rainier, WA 98576

360-584-7263
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gill Fahrenwald
PO Box 2323
Olympia, WA 98507

555-555-5555
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Steve Green
12719 Country Club Pl
Burlington, WA 98233

3605406154
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Charles Nafziger
17383 Peace Lane
Bow, WA 98232
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lisa M. Mintz Kavas
2011 142nd Pl SW
Lynnwood, WA 98087
4257434437
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Hand
7169 NE Hidden Cove Road
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

206-201-3656
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fullyScoped.
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

PAUL POTTS
1720
Raymond, WA 98577

360.942.8809
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Chad Evans
3618 Woodland Park Avenue N.
Seattle, WA 98103

555.555.5555
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

larry gales
15838 34 ave NE
Seattle, WA 98155

206 321 2084
Dear Mr. Scott,

I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

This is in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We in the US wish to tell you of our opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities which means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes closest to rail lines will also be exposed to damaging vibration from heavy coal trains.

• Burning coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada. Last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from
our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Shimeall
6634 159th Ave NE
Redmond
Washington, WA 98052
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Thomas Swoffer
32607 SE 341 St
Ravensdale, WA 98051

3608862086
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

J Heck
19293 Green Lakes Loop
Bend, OR 97702
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward... Leave It In The Ground, if you and your children want a future on This Planet...

Sincerely,

roger oborn
5823 202nd st s.w.
lynnwood, WA 98036

425 775 0209
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

d robinson
pob 151
curlew, WA 99118

509 7794967
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

anissa Duwaik
14510 E. Alki ave
spokane valley, WA 99216
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Brandt
19902 88th Ave. W
Edmonds, WA 98026

425-582-7747
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

rae pearson
5527 36th NE
Seattle, WA 98105

2065249187
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2  

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt  

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River  

Dear Mr. Scott,  

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:  

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.  

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:  

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.  

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.  

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.  

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Scheer
2715 Cody Circle...#102
Bellingham, WA 98225

360-933-4913
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Greta Rizzuti
613 W Greta Ave
Spokane, WA 99208
509-467-0131
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Timothy Keeler
16723 74th Ave NE
Kenmore, WA 98028

2063008967
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike McCormick
1414 NE 70th
Seattle, WA 98115
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bob Zeigler
1102 A Creekwood Ct. SE
Olympia, WA 98501

(360) 570-0848
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Craig Perkins
2802 NE 185th Stree
tLake Forest Park, WA 98155

4253851234
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Wagner
1408 G St
#4
Bellingham, WA 98225

3603713932
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

c: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Stocks
4932 123rd Street SW, Apt.L4
Lakewood, WA 98499
(253) 588-8849
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S. (but right across the border!). I STRONGLY agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site. YOU'VE GOT TO BE KIDDING!!!! Our opposition is based on the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you're proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported
this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING HERE!!!!

Julie Glover  
7292 Maxwelton Rd  
Clinton, WA 98236  
(360) 579-3665
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Derek Lee
Modesto
Modesto, CA 95350

209-555-5555
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jasmine Reppen
Po box 340
La conner, WA 98257

2534594049
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Blaine Ackley
655 NW 229th Ave.
Hillsboro, OR 97124

503-693-0610
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Trina Eanes
29023 180th Ave SE
Kent, WA 98042
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Steve Hersch
15305 78th Ave NE
Kenmore, WA 98028

4254882239
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Abigail Ann Fanestil
363 W Prairie Street
Sequim, WA 98382
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Treadway
1951 Circle Lane SE
Lacey, WA 98503

3604385424
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Thomas Giblin
130 Ahern Rd
Binghamton, NY 13903

6077720284
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinoagen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sara Gamble
15538 SE 168th St
Renton, WA 98058
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

c: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sally Rodgers
1407 Jefferson Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Adina Parsley
20420 Marine Dr, Apt P-2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

3606540886
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Mcintosh
2419 NE 14th st
Renton, WA 98056
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Julio Leon
8397 158th Ave NE
Apt 302
Redmond, WA 98052
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Donald Lawn
9655 California Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98136
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcino gen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

John McCann
432 NE Cliff Avenue
PO Box 133
Wilbur, WA 99185
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah J Milton
2113 Country View Lane NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jeffery McConaughy
1301 24th. Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

(360) 927-9766
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

khemarintr suwanchote
20815 25th ave s
seatac, WA 98198
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Glen Anderson
5015 15th Ave SE
Lacey, WA 98503

3604919093
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway."

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Chris Williams
1208 Division St Nw
Olympia, WA 98502
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

allan hendrix
603 Alvord Ave N
Kent, WA 98030
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

jeff weathersby
1710 redwood pl se
olympia, WA 98501
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marc Benedict
19223 Denmark St. SW
Rochester, WA 98579

360 273 9710
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Randal Jeter
4235 S Dawson St
Seattle, WA 98118
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Bessler
3300 ne Old Belfair hwy
Belfair, WA 98528

360-275-0784
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Andy Hoffman
231 Clay Court SE
Olympia, WA 98513
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Marshall
2209 NW 59th St apt2
apt#2
Seattle, WA 98107

2062977864
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Griffith
3734 H ST NE Apt-2
Auburn, WA 98002
253-929-6570
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Julene Weaver
5201 22nd Ave NE #201
Seattle, WA 98105
206 524.4496
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sammy Low
20420 Marine Dr, Apt P-2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

3606540886
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Temma Pistrang
15603 36th Ave. NE
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

206 363 0293
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks; Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester; Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Amy DyAnne Phillips
518 166th Ave NE
Bellevue, WA 98008
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jane Palajac
1000 Girard St
Apt C
Bellingham, WA 98225

260-249-7628
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Moir
14910 NE 86th Street
Vancouver, WA 98682

9712713370
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

kimberly napier
1 St. Helen's
Tacoma, WA 98402
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carole MacDonald
P O Box 2029
Maple Falls, WA 98266
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Melissa Eriksen
316 N 76th Street
Seattle, WA 98103

2069498092
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jean Hilde
1725 NE 147 Street
Shoreline, WA 98155

2063624315
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

taeler dombrosky
810 e decatur
spokane, WA 99208
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Richard Hodgin
6524 26th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

2062186386
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James Mulcare
1110 Benjamin St
Clarkston, WA 99403

509-758-3934
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

William Koopman
Timber Ct. SE
Olympia, WA ´98513
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jon Martin McCallum
2009 Columbia St SW
Olympia, WA 98501

360-754-4384
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Scott
PO Box 777
Lake Stevens, WA 98258

4254181997
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Roberta Adams
P O Box 12833
Olympia, WA 98508
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bryan Gilroy
10344 14th ave south
Seattle, WA 98168
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michael Smith
1418 Hamilton Ave
Yakima, WA 98902

509-555-5555
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

k g
3 o
orthing, WA 98360

3000000000
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Greg Onsel
122 178th Pl NE
Arlington, WA 98223

425 5083454
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dan & Pat Montague
647 73rd Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

360-709-0866
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

marjorie curci
box 502
beaver, WA 98305
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Lillie
8629 Ravenna Ave. NE
8629 Ravenna Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98115

2065243461
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Shirley Ward
6408 Beverly Lane #A
Everett, WA 98203
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alex Lenferna
12046 Lakeside Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Johnston
13421 26th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

206-367-4841
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dale Birdsell
3105 S 47th ST
H100
Tacoma, WA 98409

4259497753
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lisa Thomas
14135 233rd PL SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

4253916793
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lisa Giacchino
610 w 21st st
Vancouver, WA 98660

3609931038
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathy Kestell
15611 n little Spokane
Spokane, WA 99208

50946666110
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Fay Payton
814 SE 12th Street
College Place, WA 99324

509-876-2298
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

T Reading
POB 372
Sultan, WA 98294

0000000000
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Campbell
4009 30th Ave W
Seattle, WA 98199
Dear Jeff Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mana Iluna
4415 145th Ave. NE
H-2
Bellevue, WA 98007

425 882-2503
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Beavin
22210 17th Pl W
Bothell, WA 98021

4254856783
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

stephen friedrick
2425 Western Rd
Steilacoom, WA 98388
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Roger Cruise
332 NE 24th Ave
Portland, OR 97232
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anne Bennett
9614 N. Wickiup Crt
Spokane, WA 99208
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah Hill
1602 N Cheyenne St
Tacoma, WA 98406
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

MALCOLM AW
4518, 146th AVE S.E.
BELLEVUE, WA 98006
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

cathern murphy
307 Murdock St
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

2066792783
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

cathern murphy
307 Murdock St
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

2066792783
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Nancy Farrell
4005 N. 24th
Tacoma, WA 98406

253-952-0571
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
    Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
    Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lois Eulberg
5831 4th av nw
Seattle, WA 98107
206-276-7203
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mark Simpson
1313 W Cota St,
Trlr 9
Shelton, WA 98584
3608682077
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jill Stewart
205 244th St SW
Bothell, WA 98021
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, the regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Gardner
18474 16th Ave NW
Shoreline, WA 98177
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kim Loftness
1XXX
#206
Shoreline, WA 98155

206-349-4489
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brandon Juhl
7721 Interurban Blvd
#A
Snohomish, WA 98296

4253206200
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gary Ross
2711 W Crestline Drive
Bellingham, WA 98226
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

H. Schaefer
PO Box 1034
Sumas, WA 98295
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bonfield
5702 N 33rd St Unit 4D
Tacoma, WA 98407

7408142361
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dan Freeman
4395 Rollinghill Rd.
Clinton, WA 98236
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Kay
14806 107th way SW
Vashon, WA 98070
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway."

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Todd McKenney
590 E IslandView Rd.
GrapeView, WA 98546
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and I am writing to say I STRONGLY agree with the May 10th letter below, and I am in absolute agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition to this ludicrous and obvious last ditch attempt to grab coal corp dollars before they are forced to STOP THE CORRUPT AND BRUTAL FORCIBLE RAPE OF CANADIAN AND AMERICAN LANDS, AND POLLUTION OF OUR WATERS:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site.
individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Patrick Conn
22018 126th Court SE
Kent, WA 98031
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Gross
6536 44th Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98115

206-524-4592
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Katherine Plimpton
8760 sand point way NE
Seattle, WV 98115

206 484 5403
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tami Fosmark
17302 270th Ave SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

425-591-5653
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Theresa Schwacke
23108 63rd Ave W
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
4257742486
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah Woolston
1616 N 36th St
Unit A
Seattle, WA 98103
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Charlene Lauzon
5715 202nd St SW
Apt 3
Lynnwood, WA 98036

4259390739
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Raul de la Rosa
1312 11th CT SW
Olympia, WA 98502
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Mr. Scott,

I am from the US, and am writing to say I strongly support the May 10th letter below, which agrees with concerned Canadians whom are speaking out in opposition:

----------
We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada. .... Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered Orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.
The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

There is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Kerry R Brooks PhD
4111 S Bellegrove LN
Spokane, WA 99223
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jerald Boger
4407 s Skipworth
Spokane valley, WA 99206
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Melissa Thirloway
235 10th Ave W
Kirkland, WA 98033
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lorraine D. Johnson
4858 S. Kenny St.
SEattle, WA 98118

206-722-8922
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Martha Koester
10015 2nd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98168

206-762-6417
Dear Mr. Scott,

This is your time in history to make a decision that is difficult but right and good and the Mark of a professional, a patriot, a world citizen, a realist, and a leader. This is your time to change the course of history for the better. You can be part of the answer and stand up to climate denialism and for the future of Vancouver and even the Port itself.

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.
We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tamara Pokorny
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Patricia Herbert
PO Box 1652
Vashon, WA 98070

2064630037
Fraser Surrey Docks
Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michelle Asker
Francis ave
Spokane, WA 99205
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase.freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stephen and Kathleen Hulick
16607 N.E. 197th Ave.
Brush Prairie, WA 98606
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laura Eklund
6909 157th st ct e
Puyallup, WA 98375
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Baxter
823 18th ave w
Kirkland, WA 98033
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Thomas Reidy
9708 10th Pl SW
#202
Seattle, WA 98106

206-763-5289
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara TEMPLE-Thurston
3003 N 17th street
TACOMA, WA 98406
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tyler Nugent-Axt
2351 Cypress St.
Longview, WA 98632

3609070968
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Larry Hushagen
8406 Cedarhome Dr.
Stanwood, WA 98292
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks; Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester; Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Peter Hickner
1526 E Olin Pl
Seattle, WA 98112

2063295365
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Karen Barrett
24th Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Charles Garner
29811 Marine View Dr. SW
Federal Way, WA 98023

253 941 2511
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Delozier
2522 Mugho Street SE
Olympia, WA 98513

3604121899
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

c g
2
shoreline, WA 98133

206
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,
Pam Leonardson

Pamela Leonardson
614 SW 187th St.
Normandy Park, WA 98166
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gregory Pauley
548 26th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122

2063932523
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Charles Wilkinson
5000 26th Ave.
Seattle, WA 98108

206-723-5199
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Virgene Link
P.O.Box 543
Anacortes, WA 98221

360-293-0950
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Julie Rosmond
2626 60th Ct NW
Olympia, WA 98502

3608668120
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stephanie manzo
1812 eldridge ave
Bellingham, WA 98225

6077425698
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

constance lee
24207 116th avenue west
woodway, WA 98020

2065466186
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Harrison
13069 B 37th NE
Apt 2
Seattle, WA 98125
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you're proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carol Stanley
8629 137th Ave NE
Redmond, WA 98052

425-883-8229
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Wolfe
3213 45th Street Court NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

5555555555
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Wallace
1707 water st #6
Port Townsend, WA 98368
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lonnie Quitter
P.O.Box 2356
Suite G - Box 119
Belfair, WA 98528

360-552-2003
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marie Anderson
3249 NE 90th st
Seattle, WA 98115

2065243974
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Anita Waytz
11 Yearling Place
Bellingham, WA 98229
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

melodie martin
2339 11th ave east
2339 11th ave east
seattle, WA 98102

206-322-3341
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Francine Walbon
7724 60th Dr Ne
Apt B
Marysville, WA 98270
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christina Manetti
PO Box 99097
Lakewood, WA 98496

2535820922
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Carol Else
9702 Veterans Dr SW
Lakewood, WA 98498

253-584-2603
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Shelley Young
5113 162nd Pl SE
Bellevue, WA 98006

4258947590
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michaela Murphy
523 n 48th st
Seattle, WA 98103
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James Cronin
PO Box 9544
Spokane
Spokane, WA 99209

5092997794
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

miriam israel
9229 4th ave. nw
Sea., WA 98117

2067061833
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Solum
5 Berry Wood Place
Bellingham, WA 98229
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Conlan
6421 139th Placre NE
52
Redmond, WA 98052

4258812593
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

cas carroll
605 22nd ave e
seattle, WA 98112
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kate McWiggins
PO Box 1690
Issaquah, WA 98027

206-715-4454
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Bill Burk
56238 Bufflehead Rd
Bend, OR 97707

541-593-4421
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Amanda Witte
303 North 43rd Street
Seattle, WA 98103

2063887176
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Schutt
4964 Fire Weed Pl
Langley, WA 98260

(425) 609-1032
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am a U.S. citizen, and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Blaine Snow
6218 Woodard Bay Rd NE
Olympia, WA 98506

360-951-9797
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mike Hammerquist
700 Front St S
E110
Issaquah, WA, WA 98027
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cornelia Teed
6258 Argyle St
Ferndale, WA 98248

3603121325
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

Though my grandfather was a well-respected mine superintendent, both at Black Diamond and Roslyn, the time for coal has passed. We need to concentrate on renewable energy sources, not filthy coal, etc.

No coal exports, anywhere, no more coal mines, renew our landscapes, and keep us safe!

Polly S. Tarpley
Granddaughter of Robert MacDonald Scott, who came to the United States of America from Brechin, Scotland in 1881!

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic
climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and
seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Polly Tarpley
848 NW Bracken Ct.
Poulsbo, WA 98370

360 394-8344
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Amelia Petersen
17116 139th Pl SE
Renton, WA 98058

4053081324
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gina Schneider
1311 TAFT RD
FREELAND, WA 98249
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Thomas Koontz
4604 47th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98118
206 225-6887
Dear Mr. Scott,

I live in Blaine, WA, on the Salish Sea, walking distance to the Canada border. I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, from concerned Canadians who are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full
public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ronaye Tylor
206 10th Street
Blaine, WA 98230
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James DeCelle
2117 Cole St. Apt. A
Enumclaw, WA 98022
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Kathlene Croasdale
8019 145th AVE NE
Redmond, WA 98052

425-820-9483
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lynne Miller
803 NE 125th Ave
Vancouver, WA 98684

360-356-4944
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jesse Paulsen
1841 23rd Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

María-Teresa de Balin
5313 NE 66th Ave B-15
Vancouver, WA 98661
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Karen Peddersen
3202 McKinley avenue
Tacoma, WA 98404
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gena DiLabio
3124 Dakota Dr
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

3604288875
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deborah Efron
10129 Main Street, Apt 307
Apt 307
Bellevue, WA 98004

4254538541
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

John Bayer
3599 X Street
Washougal, WA 98671

3608445303
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Linzmeier
950 E. Wilmette Rd.
Palatine, IL 60074

(847) 778-9915
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laurence Ebersole
4700 12th Ave NE Apt 207
Seattle, WA 98105

2065279683
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Charlene Davies
2217 W. Pacific Ave.
Apt. 104
Spokane, WA 99201

5094557610
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Thank you.

Ron DiGiacomo
2307 22nd Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

206-221-6345
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Brandie Deal
301 225th St SW
Bothell, WA 98021

425-761-5938
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jill Yetter
12034 15th Ave NE
Uit 109
Seattle, WA 98125
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Wasserman
1510 n. STEELE STREET
Tacoma, WA 98406
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Evenson
16016  29th ave ct-e
Tacoma, WA 98445

330-461-2000
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Antoinette Soffes
21323 2nd Ave SE
Bothell, WA 98021
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Taylor
721 N 138th St
Seattle, WA 98133

2063491856
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Howard Pellett
5293 Guemes Island Road
Anacortes, WA 98221

360-293-8128
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mr. Shelley Dahlgren, PhD
4449 242nd ave. S. E.
Issaquah, WA 98029

4444444444
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Linda Massey
819 Virginia Street
Seattle, WA 98101

206-621-8891
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Michelle Stepp
PMB 6288
PO BOX 257
Olympia, WA 98507

(253) 414-7487
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Craig Swanson
16220 SE 28th PL
Bellevue, WA 98008
4257476987
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

bea wilson
1033 9th south
edmonds, WA 98020

425 377 6624
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Neill
1313 Broadway
1200
Bellingham, WA 98225

360 303 4428
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Gail Shackel
3211 Pt. White Dr. NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

James French
Apt. #301
9233 Interlake Ave North
Seattle, WA 98103

206-517-2828
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

P M
Maddox Creek Ln
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

360-669-3938
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jeffry Yaplee
2817 34th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98144

(206) 722-8115
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Laura Ackerman
3118 S. Windsor Rd.
Spokane, WA 99224

509 624-1832
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stuart Mork
7710 31st Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elena Naskova
5201 Erskine way, SW
Seattle, WA 98136
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lynn Rabenstein
201 N. Section St.
Burlington, WA 98233
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Colony
1822 38th Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

2065233810
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

nora regan
1331 olympic ave
port townsend, WA 98368

360 385-3369
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alison Eckels
311 N 47th St
Seattle, WA 98103
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dennis Underwood
1809 E 31st St
Tacoma, WA 98404

2064278550
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon Bergquist-Moody
1921 Ethridge Ave. NE
Olympia, WA 98506

3607051162
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon Truax
3221-27th Ave West
Seattle, WA 98199
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

#Patricia A Lenzen
12800 New 4th st. #ff57
Vancouver, WA 98684

360 607 1316
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

ray lou
705 s weller
apt 1225
seattle, WA 98104
206-802-8383
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

FORREST RODE
1616 SUMMIT AVE 502
SEATTLE, WA 98122

(206) 920-6117
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joel Finley
809 Ford St Apt B
Ogdensburg, NY 13669

6746754368
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ronnie Arry
21305 48th Ave W. B-204
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lisa Agard
1311 S 13th St
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

2064060027
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

carol dillon
145 nw 74th st.
seattle, WA 98117

206-783-7498
Dear Jeff Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Denee Scribner
1113 E 2nd Ave
Ellensburg, WA 98926

509 933 2550
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Lindberg
10903 NE 102nd Street
Vancouver, WA 98662

360-771-1669
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Christie Bruntlett
499 Annie Place
Cheney, WA 99004
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Diane Sullivan
1231 SW Kalama
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

(360) 675-1342
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Wayne White
7808 N. Morton St. #731
Spokane, WA 99208

(509) 466 0157
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kevin Chiu
10110 NE 38th Court
Kirkland, WA 98033
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

J Thrush
90 sherry av
Naches, WA 98937

Unlisted
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Andrew Wilks
1312 E Denny
Seattle, WA 98122

206 2915495
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Holly Hallman
22494 SE 42ND TER
ISSAQUAH, WA 98029

4257362684
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Robert Whitbeck
1554 Hillside Dr SE
Issaquah, WA 98027
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Peggy Page
24324 Miller Rd
Stanwood, WA 98292

360-631-9641
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Boni Biery
903 N 188th St
Shoreline, WA 98133

206.542.4722
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jane Metcalfe
811 NE 55
Seattle, WA 98105
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

ruth riordan
98 garden drive
walla walla, WA 99362

50*-301-3481
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Howard Clark
12205 Sapphire LN SE
Olalla, WA 98359
2538571065
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alice Steijn
973 Quartz Drive SW
North Bend, WA 98045

3023883175
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

LUKE STAMBAUGH
18311 ne 25th st
redmond, WA 98052
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Raymond Velasquez
19631 SE 259th Street
Covington, WA 98042
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Matthew Boguske
11808 93 Ln Ne #302
302
Kirkland, WA 98034

4252027998
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Marie weis
248 Shorewood Ct
Fox Island, WA 98333

2535492600
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Richard Frichette
12 Pearl Place
Sequim, WA 98382

3606816474
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ruth Darden
900 University St.
Seattle, WA 98101

206 748-7395
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freigher traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Donald Read
3312 S. Holly Pl
Seattle, WA 98118

(206) 354-3420
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

anne bagdon
2829 NW 68th St
seattle, WA 98117
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ellen Madsen
4044 -11th Ave NW
Olympia, WA 98502

360 866-1327
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

c: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Russell Klanke
16034 28th Ave NE
Shoreline, WA 98155
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sabrina Garrison
12614 138th ST. KpN
Gig Harbor, WA 98329
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jamie Caya
9401 Silver Star Ave
Vancouver, WA 98664

3609015692
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port's previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a "marine highway."

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company's owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mlou Christ
Wlk samm pkwy ne
Redmond, WA 98052

5034320909
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Wendy Atmore
16340 Interlake Ave. N.
Shoreline, WA 98133
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Renee Vincent
931 E Oak Street
Sequim, WA 98382
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judy D’Amore
739 Adams Street
Port Townsend
Port Townsend, WA 98368

3603790370
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jared Howe
4107 Martin Luther King, Jr. Way S
Seattle, WA 98108

206-250-2568
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dan Snyder
5904 53rd StreetCourt West
University Place, WA 98467
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ted Pratt
8624 Cabot st se
Olympia, WA 98501

(360)352-5327
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

keith cowan
3709 S.W. Trenton St.
Seattle, WA 98126

2069329064
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Julia Hurd
19396 Ashe Lane
Burlington, WA 98233

360 724-3404
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judith Butler
1010 South Rockwood Blvd
Spokane, WA 99202
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Holli Smith
16725 NE 98th Place
Redmond, WA 98052

425-861-0254
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Don Huling
17117 SE 329th St.
Auburn, WA 98092

(253) 887-8721
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Justin Hahn
1977 Bigelow Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Janet Triplett
PO Box 146
18821 640th Ln NE
Baring, WA 98224
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Daniel McLeod
5095 Bittrich-Antler Rd.
Deer Park, WA 99006

509 276 6706
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am a neighbor from San Juan County in the U.S., and I am writing to say I agree very strongly with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full
public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Ferm
5062 New Sweden Rd NE
Bainbridge Is, WA 98110

2068421304
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mark Beringer
225 238th St SW
Bothell, WA 98021

425-486-0869
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Arnold Martin
631 Chenault Ave
Hoquiam, WA 98550

360/580-1961
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Stucki
517 Carlyon Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Noel Barnes
1614 Glenwood Ave. S.E.
Renton, WA 98058

4254300733
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Patricia Cole
1804 E 14th Ave
Ellensburg, WA 98926
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Joyce Grajczyk
12026 SE 216th St.
Kent, WA 98031

111-111-1111
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Lynne Treat
674 NE Franklin Avenue
Street Address 2
Chehalis, WA 98532

360-740-1825
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brock
3302 Walnut Court
Camano Island, WA 98282

360-387-7903
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sharon Wilson
retired environmental engineer
3240 NE 96th St
Seattle, WA 98115

2065225971
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward; Renewable and Sustainable Energy only- Wind, Solar, Geo-Thermal, Tidal, etc...

Sincerely,

Mike and Kathy Sherman
11556 Greenwood Avenue North
#301
Seattle, WA 98133
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Heather Elder
4517 SW Wildwood PL
Seattle, WA 98136

7704024113
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dick Dierks
218 E. Harris St.
Appleton, WI 54911
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Michelson
9224 52nd ln.n.e.
OLYMPIA, WA 98516
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tory and Ann Tjersland
2022 Lakemoor Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98512

360-943-4783
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighborhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometers long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbors in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

George Metsopulos
7013 82nd Ave. NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98335
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Susan Alter
204 N 195th Street
Shoreline, WA 98133

n/a
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Maria Ross
18429 12th Ave.NE
Seattle, WA 98155
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

c: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Mary Onufer
16129 Tiger Mt Rd SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

425 391 4168
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Renay Shaffer
N Hatch Rd
Colbert, WA 99005
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

mike doherty
617 So. B. St.
port angeles, WA 98363

360 457 9135
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Traci Fairbanks
6000 sweet lake helena rd
port orchard, WA 98367
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Cherie Warner
645 SW Mies Street
Pullman, WA 99163

5093344440
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Barbara Keyt
80 Bulldozer Flats
Shelton, WA 98584

360-426-6261
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ray & Charlotte Kanemori
9733 112th Ave. NE
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Kirkland, WA 98033
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Dave Roehm
1619A 225 Lane
Ocean Park, WA 98640
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Beth Martof
14290 Madison Ave NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Paul Nelson
Apt. 414-701 Esquimalt Rd.
Victoria, BC V9A 3L5
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you're proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Don Ely
7109 46th Ave E
Tacoma, WA 98443

2533106461
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Purcell
218 Sea Pines Rd
Bellingham, WA 98229

3607561294
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Ai McCarthy
15807 NE 49th St.
Redmond, WA 98052
206-890-1489
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Deena Sadek
7702 28th Avenue NW
Seattle, WA 98117
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

- This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

- When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

- This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Penny Derleth
PO Box 421
Deer Park, WA 99006

5092623456
Jeff Scott  
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP  
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main  
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2  

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;  
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;  
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt  

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Sherry Williams
2706 NE 5th Court
Renton, WA 98056

4252710911
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Tracy Edmonson
504 S Ainsworth Apt B
Tacoma, WA 98405
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

fred karlson
5779 vista dr
ferndale, WA 98248

3603801799
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency, the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

David Kietzke
3057 50 Ave. SW
Seattle, WA 98116
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judith Coates
41 Windmill Lane
Sequim, WA 98382

360-681-5233
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped...
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Richard Frith
3011 NW 94th St
Seattle, WA 98117

2067892567
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Alan Hardcastle
Olympia, WA

Alan Hardcastle
406 18th ave SE
Olympia, WA 98501
Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Camille Jackson
13715 SW Devonshire Dr
Beaverton, OR 97005

5036418948
Fraser Surrey Docks

Jeff Scott
CEO Fraser Surrey Docks LP
PO Box 2233 Vancouver Main
Vancouver, BC V6B 3W2

cc: Fraser Surrey Docks;
Port Metro Vancouver CEO Robin Silvester;
Federal Minister of Transport, Lisa Raitt

Re: your proposal to build a coal port serving ocean going vessels on the Fraser River

Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

T WILLIAM BOOTH
450 WOOD AV SW
APT 2B
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

206-465-8299
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Jason Hann
PO Box 354
Redmond, WA 98073
Dear Mr. Scott,

I am from the U.S., and so I am writing to say I strongly agree with the May 10th letter below, in agreement with the concerned Canadians that are speaking out in opposition:

We write in response to your announcement that you intend to replace plans for a coal barge loading facility with plans to build a coal port serving ocean-going vessels at your Surrey site.

We wish to inform you of our ongoing opposition to the construction of any coal operations on the banks of the Fraser River, for reasons including the following:

• This proposal will increase open-car coal train traffic through our residential communities. More coal train traffic means our families will be exposed to more diesel exhaust (a known carcinogen), more coal dust, and more nighttime noise from train whistles at levels deemed unsafe by the World Health Organization. Homes in neighbourhoods closest to rail lines will also be exposed to more potentially damaging vibration from heavy coal trains more than 2 kilometres long.

• When burned, the coal exported from Fraser Surrey Docks would release as much global warming pollution as the 6th largest polluter in Canada - just behind the two biggest tar sands processing facilities and the three biggest coal-fired power plants. Just last week UN Climate Chief Christiana Figueres said that in order to avoid runaway, catastrophic climate change there is no room in the world for new coal developments. That includes new ports like the one you’re proposing.

• This proposal will increase freighter traffic in the Salish Sea, increasing risk of oil spills and shipping accidents and impacts on wild salmon and endangered orca populations.

We remind you that in June 2013, Metro Vancouver, our regional government, voted overwhelmingly to oppose any coal exports from your Fraser River site. Numerous individual municipalities, including New Westminster, Surrey, White Rock, Delta, Richmond and Vancouver have either opposed this project outright or demanded full public hearings, an independent health impact assessment (HIA) and a fully-scoped
environmental assessment before any approvals were granted for your project.

The call for an HIA to fully evaluate the risks posed by your proposal came directly from our regional health authorities. Numerous health care groups and doctors have supported this request.

As you know, to date these requests remain unanswered. Public hearings, an HIA and a fully scoped EA have not taken place for this project. In general, the lack of meaningful consultation with the public, local and regional governments and health authorities has been an issue of ongoing concern during the review of your project.

There is widespread opposition to your project. The cities of Surrey and New Westminster have indicated they will apply to intervene in the legal challenge of the Port’s previous approval of your direct transfer coal facility, initiated by Communities and Coal, Voters Taking Action on Climate Change and two individual applicants. The Musqueam Nation has filed its own, separate legal challenge of the permitting of your facility as well. Further, we note that your company has been a strong advocate for removal of the George Massey Tunnel and deeper dredging of the Fraser River — modifications to the river would allow deeper draft vessels to reach your facility, effectively turning the Fraser into a “marine highway.”

We are deeply concerned that if these modifications come to pass your facility will begin exporting larger volumes of coal on bigger vessels. This will mean still more coal trains through our communities, more noise, diesel exhaust and coal dust, more ship traffic in the Salish Sea, and more climate-harming pollution when the exported coal is burned. This is not something we want to see happen in our region, and we know that our neighbours in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana are working hard to stop more coal trains from running through, and new coal ports from being built, in their communities to avoid these same impacts.

Mr. Scott, we have nothing against your company and wish it well, but there is no future in exporting thermal coal. The end of the age of coal has been acknowledged by a wide range of organizations including the World Bank, HSBC, Goldman Sachs, the International Energy Agency the US Export-Import Bank and even executives of your company’s owner, the MacQuarrie Group. We share their concerns about coal and climate change and our opposition to this project will not end. We want our communities to host the ports of tomorrow, not the ports of yesterday. We urge you to abandon plans for this coal port and seek a different path forward.

Sincerely,

Judith Shardo
8218 SE 26th St
Mercer Island, WA 98040

615-414-9904