

Federal Authority Advice Record (FAAR)**FAAR Response must be submitted by July 24, 2026**

Trigon Pacific LPG Project – Trigon Pacific Terminals Ltd.

Registry File: 90557

Department/Agency	Health Canada (HC)
Lead Contact	Helen (Hsin-ming) Yeh, Environmental Assessment Specialist, Safe Environments Directorate (SED)
Full Address	1138 Melville St., Vancouver, BC V6E 4S3
Email	Hsin-ming.yeh@hc-sc.gc.ca
Telephone	778-839-2771
Alternate Contact	Paula Smith, paula.smith@hc-sc.gc.ca

1. Will your department or agency exercise a **power, perform a duty or function**, or provide **financial assistance**, related to the project to enable it to be carried out in whole or in part?

As relevant,

- Specify the power, duty or function, or financial assistance, and the likelihood that it will be required to construct the project, based on the Initial Project Description, as either Required, Potential, Likely, Unlikely or Not Required
- Describe any associated Indigenous or public consultation, including timelines
- Describe any associated information requirements (e.g., alternative means assessment, habitat offsetting), and specify those that may be coordinated with the impact assessment process, if an impact assessment is required
- Identify any associated project-specific guidance or issues of which the proponent should be aware, or information the proponent should provide
- Indicate whether your department or agency has identified any power that it will not be exercising or may not be able to exercise to allow the project to be carried out, in whole or in part.

[Health Canada \(HC\) will not exercise a power, perform a duty or function, or provide financial assistance related to the Project.](#)

2. **Using Table 1**, identify project- and context- specific **key issues**, based on the expertise within your mandate¹ and the information in your possession, including the Initial Project Description, any exchanges with the proponent or others related to the project and known means to address the effects of the project. For each key issue:
- Specify the key issue (e.g., specific species and location)
 - Specify the project component or activity linked to the key issue
 - Explain why it's a key issue based on:
 - biophysical effect pathway(s) from the specific project component or activity
 - concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate
 - the issue being material² to decision making under the *Impact Assessment Act*
 - Identify how the issue could be resolved, including through means other than an impact assessment
 - Identify additional information the proponent could provide including to give confidence on how the issue can be addressed through other means.

¹ Refer to the [Memoranda of Understanding with IAAC](#).

² An issue is material to decision making if its analysis is anticipated to affect the conclusions on (1) whether adverse effects within federal jurisdiction or direct and incidental adverse effects (collectively adverse federal effects) are likely not significant, or of low, medium or high significance; (2) appropriate mitigation measures for significant adverse federal effects; or (3) justification in the public interest.

Helen Yeh,
Environmental Assessment Specialist – SED

Name and Title of Departmental /
Agency Responder

July 21, 2026

Date

Table 1: Key Issues to inform the impact assessment process

This table should outline key issues to inform the impact assessment process, including whether an impact assessment is required and, if so, the scope of the assessment and tailoring of the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines.

Key issues are the major concerns directly related to a project component or activity, the analysis of which is anticipated to be material to decision-making under the *Impact Assessment Act*.

Federal authorities' advice should be guided by the identification and resolution of key issues. If an impact assessment is required, it will be focused on key issues.

Comment ID	a) Key issue	b) Project component or activity	c)(i) Biophysical effect pathway(s)	c)(ii) Concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate	c)(iii) Material to federal decision-making	d) Means for issue resolution	e) Additional information from the proponent
<i>Identify comments by organization and comment number.</i> e.g., IAAC-01	<i>Specify the key issue (e.g., specific species and location).</i>	<i>Identify the project component or activity linked to the key issue.</i> <i>Be specific about the nature, scale, novelty and complexity or the component or activity.</i>	<i>Identify the specific biophysical effect pathway between the project component or activity and the affected environmental or human receptor (including Indigenous Peoples).</i>	<i>Describe why it's a key issue within the mandate of your department or agency, including in terms of priorities of the federal government and in terms of anticipated likelihood, severity or uncertainty of effects.</i> <i>Identify if the key issue is common for projects of this nature or in this sector, or whether it's unique to this project due to its complexity, size or novelty; a sensitive or rare receiving environment; and/or proximity of sensitive environmental or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples).</i>	<i>Describe why the key issue is material to decision-making as either:</i> <i>an adverse effect within federal jurisdiction, or a direct or incidental adverse effect, that may be significant based on available evidence including:</i> <i>federal experts' knowledge and experience with past project assessments;</i> <i>presence of sensitive species, habitats or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples);</i> <i>novel or complex project activities, components or technologies;</i> <i>high uncertainties in effects or in the effectiveness of mitigation measures;</i> <i>unknown or unproven mitigation; or</i> <i>a factor for the justification in the public interest anticipated to be material to decision-making such as a likely positive effect contributing to sustainability, to Canada's environmental obligations or climate change commitments or in supporting governmental priorities, such as reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples.</i>	<i>Describe how the key issue could be resolved or addressed by:</i> <i>Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance that your department or agency has;</i> <i>Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance from another jurisdiction, including the province;</i> <i>Common, proven, well-understood or standard mitigation measures to mitigate the effect or effect pathway(s); or</i> <i>Commitments made by the proponent (e.g., in the Initial Project Description).</i>	<i>Describe information the proponent can provide, or commitments the proponent can make, in their Response to the Summary of Issues that would provide confidence that the issue can be resolved by existing means.</i> <i>Consider whether information, studies, analyses or collaborative work with other authorities would be required to address the issue beyond existing means.</i>
HC-01	Potential exposure of Indigenous peoples to noise and contaminants of potential concern (COPCs)	Activities throughout the life of the Project (e.g., construction and operations) will potentially emit noise and contaminants into the environment where Indigenous peoples may be exposed. Sources of Project-related noise and COPCs (e.g., particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, sulphur oxides, carbon monoxide, diesel	Project related activities (e.g., LPG processing and storage, rail and vessel traffic) could emit noise which could potentially impact Indigenous peoples. Project emissions could result in Indigenous peoples being exposed to COPCs through contact with	Under the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> (IAA), HC provides expert information and knowledge to support the assessment of impacts on Indigenous health. Potential exposure to noise and COPCs is commonly observed with rail and vessel traffic, flaring, fugitive emissions such as venting, and will be	As per IAA Sections 2(e) and 2(f), adverse effects on the health of Indigenous peoples related to the Project falls within federal jurisdiction. The Project is within the territories of the Gitxaala Nation, Gitga'at First Nation, Kitselas First Nation, Kitsumkalum First Nation, Lax Kw'alaams Band, and Metlakatla First Nation. The Project is located on Ridley Island, and is approximately 10 km south of Prince Rupert. The District Municipality of Port Edward is the closest community to the Project site, located approximately 2 km to the east and Indigenous people represent approximately 50% of the municipality's total population ³ .	The IPD indicates that impacts to Indigenous health related to emissions (including effluent, air quality, and noise) will be further assessed in subsequent review steps and the Proponent will continue to engage with First Nations (pp. 42- 44). In addition, the Proponent is open to addressing the cumulative effects from rail and shipping by working with new or existing regional initiatives such as the North Coast rail forum, Transport Canada's Cumulative Effects of Marine Shipping	1. To address potential impacts on noise, HC recommends including all Project related activities such as rail and vessel traffic in the noise assessment. 2. To address the issue of potential contaminant exposure, HC recommends that an HHRA be undertaken. An HHRA can be used to identify relevant COPCs and exposure pathways

³ Indigenous Population Profile, 2021 Census of Population Profile table: Port Edward, District municipality [Census subdivision], British Columbia. Available at: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/ipp-ppa/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&DGUID=2021A00055947007&SearchText=Port%20Edward&HP=0&HH=0&GENDER=1&AGE=1&RESIDENCE=1&TABID=1>

		particulate matter, polycyclic aromatic compounds, and volatile organic compounds) emissions include, but are not limited to, vehicles, ground flare, on-site power generator (if not electric), compressors, Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG) vaporizer, and Project-related activities such as rail and LPG vessel traffic. The Initial Project Description (IPD) states total deliveries are expected to be 98 to 120 railcars per day (p. 22), and approximately 42 to 83 LPG vessels per year (p. 23). While the Proponent has communicated that it will not be the owner or transporter of the product, trains and vessels will be sources of noise and COPC emissions.	environmental media (e.g., air). An example of potential exposure routes includes: • Inhalation of COPCs in contaminated air resulting from combustion, venting and/or dust generation.	applicable to this Project.	The IPD states that the “[u]se of the land or resources on the Project site by the Indigenous community for traditional purposes has been restricted ... since the site was developed for industrial use in the 1980s. However, the Indigenous community continues to use the marine environment surrounding Ridley Island for various uses, including fishing and travel” (p. 38). “Fishing is an important cultural, commercial, and recreational activity for Indigenous Nations and the people of the Prince Rupert and Port Edward area” (p. 35). The IPD indicates noise and vibration experienced by residents of Port Edward is currently affected by existing Ridley Island operating facilities (p. 31). The potentially impacted Indigenous Nations have raised concerns regarding cumulative impacts from increasing rail and shipping traffic (p. 40).	Assessment and/or Prince Rupert Port Authority’s cumulative effects framework (p. 40). To understand the overall Project-related impacts on the health of Indigenous peoples, HC recommends that a noise assessment and a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) of potential Project impacts including cumulative impacts from rail and vessel traffic be undertaken as part of the Impact Statement. The results of the HHRA can inform necessary Project-specific monitoring and mitigation measures. HC’s guidance documents can be found at the following links: • Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Effects in Impact Assessment: Air Quality. • Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Effects in Impact Assessment: Country Foods. • Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Effects in Impact Assessment: Drinking and Recreational Water Quality. • Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Effects in Impact Assessment: Human Health Risk Assessment. • Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Effects in Impact Assessment: Noise.	and estimate the likelihood and severity of adverse health effects. Where available, health-based guidelines are recommended to be used in the HHRA.
--	--	---	---	------------------------------------	---	--	---

Please insert additional rows as necessary.