

Kitimat Harbour Group's Oral Presentation to the Joint Review Panel
for the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
August 31, 2010

Good Morning Panel Members and Ladies and Gentlemen:

My name is Victor Maskulak and my co-presenter is Ron Burnett, we are both members of the Kitimat Harbour Group. We have seven (7) members, all volunteers (retired or semi-retired) ,who meet weekly to discuss and investigate development opportunities for our community of Kitimat and/or the region.

We believe that the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project, following the review process, will be a great economic benefit to Canada because it provides access for our petroleum to the world markets. Canada is an exporting nation and we depend upon this revenue for taxation to ensure our high standard of living can be maintained and to provide for the social services which we cherish.

My portion of this presentation will deal with the pipeline route between the proposed tunnels in the east and the Kitimat Marine Terminal in the west.

Starting in the eastern section, and working west. Refer to **Volume1: Figure 2-1**, which is a map of the tunnel location in relation to the creeks, rivers and mountain peaks. The small creek in the middle of the diagram is labelled Hoult and it is shown flowing into the Clore River. This is the same name of the Creek to the west which flows into the Kitimat River, upon which, this application proposal is based. Consideration should be given to amending this figure by removing it, as it can be confusing and misleading to the untrained eye.

From the exit of the Hoult tunnel, the pipeline enters the Kitimat River drainage and follows a logging road, located on the valley floor, for approximately 36 km. There is another pipeline that is approved for construction, to follow the same route. This pipeline is a natural gas line proposed by Pacific Trails and it contains the feed stock for the proposed Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) converting plant located south of the Northern Gateway Pipeline Marine Terminal, in Kitimat.

Our concern is about physical location of these pipelines and their relationship to the water courses which parallel the entire route.

- 1. Is it possible to have three access roads?**
- 2. Could these rights of way be shared?**

We are particularly concerned about the location of these rights of way for the next 4 km below the exit of the Hoult tunnel. An additional concern is the guarantee of future access to undeveloped resources and public access to wilderness areas.

The applicant is seeking an interim licence of occupation leading to a statutory right of way agreement. The application states that the entire pipeline route will be accessed by an all weather road **but we ask, will other parties have free access over this right of way?**

Another concern we have with this 36 Kilometre section is the lack of block valves.

- the last block valve is located at the exit to the Hoult tunnel and
- the next one is to be located 40 km. to the west, at the Clearwater pump station.

There are two major creeks crossing in this section, those being Hunter Creek and Chist Creek and a number of intermittent creeks.

The application states that most major creek crossings will have block valves, but this preliminary proposal does not include any within this section.

- **We ask, what is the risk assessment evaluation for any potential interrupted flow problems?**

- **The application states that National Energy Board standards will be met or exceeded.**
- **We are assuming that these standards contain regulations about the location and duration for block valves and or let down stations.**

Under Section II of the application, and under the heading "**Terrain**", it states and I quote, "**that the project could have a cumulative effect with other planned pipeline projects. However, based on the assumption of satisfactory joint planning and operation, the effects are expected to be minimal**".

We request that the certificate that you issue makes it mandatory that all stakeholders be involved and that if necessary, that the NEB will appoint an arbitrator to resolve any conflict.

The next area of concern is access to and through the Kitimat Marine Terminal area. This is within **Volume 6B: Figures 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4**. This is a very complex situation. There is a long list of challenges:

1. the access road must cross private land
2. a by-pass road may be built to circumvent the terminal area
3. security of infrastructure is a requirement to ensure a safe terminal operation
4. security from daily public access
5. uninterrupted vehicle access is necessary to the proposed liquefied natural gas plant
6. vehicle access to allow for future development areas along the foreshore
7. this is an established timber harvesting area, and seasonal access is required
8. two petroleum pipelines are to be located within this area
9. one natural gas pipeline must be located through this area
10. year-round access to recreational areas is required
11. all of the above is within the District of Kitimat boundaries

The terminal is located on broken terrain but access for the pipelines, hydro line and by-pass road must cross very steep rocky hillsides. It appears that a final access route has not been decided. However, if a by-pass road is built, the applicant shows a permanent excess rock cut disposal area located on a very steep hillside. We are assuming that this excess large volume must be excavated to build the road and pipeline trenches. This is a large area and we feel it does not meet visual quality guidelines, that all resource developers in British Columbia must follow. We suggest that this material be moved off site and it be recycled as aggregate.

My observation of the proposed by-pass road junction, with the permit road, does not allow for safe travel for personnel carriers or heavy logging trucks. We want assurances that, whichever access road is to be utilized, that the design standards for grades and curvature are for a safe, all weather road for any type of vehicle traffic.

In conclusion, our town of Kitimat was established in the early 1950's when the Aluminum Company of Canada developed the potential of producing hydro to manufacture aluminum. In some circles, this was considered an engineering and construction marvel. We feel that this entire project will receive similar recognition in the future, if it proceeds.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our thoughts and concerns on this project and now, I reintroduce the Chairman of our development group, Ron Burnett.