Environmental Impact Assessment

Garibaldi at Squamish Ski Resort

The following is a summary of an independent environmental impact assessment of the Garibaldi at Squamish ski resort, regarding both the ecologically sensitive area surrounding the proposed project, as well as the elevation. Geographical analysis findings indicate the following:

- 31.8% of the project area is below the 600 meters elevation level that is recommended for assured snow
- 7.9% of the project area is within the winter habitat ranges for ungulates
- 6.78% of the land has old growth forest
- 26.6% of the land is within fish bearing streams or fish habitat
- A total of 37% of the project area is protected land

Based on these findings, I do not recommend that this project go forward in its current form. Given the large portion of protected land included within the project boundary, this project is likely to have wide ranging ecological ramifications. Furthermore, acknowledging future impacts of climate change, the snowline will increase in elevation over time. This will result in an even greater percentage of the project area falling below the required elevation.

Future analysis should include more detailed projections of changes in the snowline due to climate change. This could be done by utilizing datasets from other areas of similar geographic characteristics and extrapolating the results to obtain a projection for the progression of the snowline over time. Additionally, other datasets should be obtained concerning habitats of other animals in the area to more accurately assess the ecological impacts. More detailed analysis should also be done to project changes in animal population dynamics that would be caused by displacing the animals already known to have habitat in this area (eg. potential large affects on the ecosystem by ungulates being forced to different areas).

Far more consideration should be given to the financial aspect of the project as well, given the concerns mentioned above. Detailed budget information should be obtained for the project and assessed for feasibility because necessary adjustments to the project to accommodate the concerns may push the budget of the project beyond a reasonable level.

Sources of error of error in this analysis are that river segments used to assess fish habitat area included all rivers that fell within the buffer range at any point, which may have overestimated the total fish habitat area. Finally, only ungulate habitat, old growth forest, and fish habitat

Graham Mainer-Pearson 46333571

were assessed for protected land. If other reasons for protected land to exist in this area are present, they were not included in this analysis.