

# Canaport LNG Project

## Canaport Community Environmental Liaison Committee (CCELC)

Minutes of Meeting CCELC # 25  
Tuesday September 12, 2006  
Approved as Amended

Red Head United Church  
6:05 pm – 9:30pm

### Committee Present:

- Armstrong, Carol Resident
- Armstrong, Stu Co-chair of CCELC, Resident
- Barton, Dianna Enterprise Saint John
- Brown, Alice Resident
- Court, Ivan City of Saint John Councilor
- Dalzell, Gordon SJ Citizens Coalition for Clean Air
- Debly, Teresa Resident
- Griffin, Dennis Resident
- Griffin, Glenn Resident
- Hunter, Roger Resident
- Johnston, Jan Resident
- MacKinnon, Claude ACAP Representative
- Quinn, Kevin Bay Pilots & Marine Consultants
- Smith, Elsie Resident
- Thompson David Member
- Thompson, Jean Resident

### Committee Absent:

- Bruce, Patrick Member
- Lyttle, Dwain Resident
- Macaulay, David Resident
- Malcharek, Rainer Bayside Power
- Perry, Yvonne Resident
- Rogers, Kathy Member
- Roy, Beth Resident
- Sherman, Peter Resident
- Turner, Rick Saint John Board of Trade

### Resources:

- Azcarraga, Adolfo Canaport LNG
- Caines, Crystal Fundy Engineering
- Forsythe, Fraser Canaport LNG

- Kellock, John                      Emera Brunswick
- Logan, John                         Irving Oil Limited
- Long, Warren                        Irving Oil Limited
- McLaughlin, Gary                 Fundy Engineering
- Peterson, David                     Department of Environment NB
- Rankin, Steve                        Emera Brunswick
- Seheult, Peter                        Emera Brunswick
- Van der Veen, Carolyn             Canaport LNG

**Opening Remarks:**

The meeting commenced at 6:05 pm with Co-Chair Warren Long welcoming the representatives from Emera, all returning committee members and observers.

**Review & Approval of minutes from August 8<sup>th</sup> meeting:**

The minutes of meeting #24 (August 8<sup>th</sup>) were reviewed and approved with no changes motioned by Gordon D. and seconded by Claude M. This motion was approved.

**Report on Action Items from August 8<sup>th</sup> meeting:**

- 24-1: (Ivan C.)The road repairs will be discussed at budget time.
- 24-2: The construction standards referenced for the applicable structures for building an LNG facility are CSA Z276, NFPA 59 and the National Building Code NBCC – 1995.
- 24-3: Item carried forward to the table of outstanding action items.
- 24-4: Certificate of approvals were made available to those members who wished to receive copies.
- 24-5: Ivan C. will follow up with the city and coordinate with Glen G. regarding timing for the drive to identify repairs on the Red Head Road.
- 24-6: Canaport LNG is required to obtain an import license for LNG.

Teresa D. inquired for more details regarding the import license.

*Action item 25-1: Obtain further clarification from Repsol on the LNG import licensing requirements and the process in Canada.*

- 24-7: John Logan explained the minor change to the pier design, which included a slight orientation change. The pier design is the same as the design proposed in the EIS, with the exception of the slight orientation change described above.

Q1. (Denis G.) What other possibilities are CLNG exploring for the multipurpose pier?

A1. Currently, the pier is only approved for LNG and Orimulsion fuel.

Q2. Would a new EIA be required to receive other fuels?

A2. (David P.) Condition 5 in the August 6, 2004 EIA limited the use of the pier for any other fuels (except LNG & Orimulsion), and would require a new EIA. A new EIA might not be required to be a comprehensive assessment, but it would require public input.

Q3. (Ivan C.) Were the safety issues related to Mispic Park included in the review process of the consequence analysis?

A3. (David P.) In the event of a catastrophic failure, (*i.e.*, a one meter hole or larger in the structure) there would be a possible impact, although not immediate (as in seconds or minutes). The timeframe for action would likely be hours. As the terminal operations manual is developed, this would likely address this issue in conjunction with the city of Saint John Fire Chief.

Q4. What is the likelihood of a catastrophic failure?

A4. Catastrophic studies are not a requirement of the construction or operating codes, as a result of the low probability, per Transport Canada and the Coast Guard Oil Handling Facility Act. Catastrophic studies were however completed for this Project.

Q5. (Ivan C.) In the event of a spill, will there be a response unit at the site?

A5. Yes.

Q6. (Teresa D.) If the catastrophic studies done by Quest were not a requirement, why were they done?

A6. David P. commented that he would suggest they were raised as an issue by the Department of the Environment's Technical Review Committee. The original EIA Terms of Reference would have the background related to this issue.

Q7. (Denis G.) There have been many minor changes to the LNG facility. When do minor changes become major changes that require a new EIA and can you define the difference?

Action item 25-2: Review the EIA document and summarize the list of changes related to the design of the LNG Facility, how many and what they are.

24-8: (Fraser F.) All construction equipment used on the LNG site must have a valid license and or safety certification as well as operators must have appropriate training and certification. Equipment has in fact been turned away from entering the site as a result of safety related inspections. Visual inspections are performed as well onsite and results are logged daily as the rounds are made.

24-9 Copies of the certificate of approval for the concrete batch plant were made available at this meeting for those that wished to obtain a copy.

- 24-10 IOL and contractors are continuing to monitor current and future grubbing piles and have added silt fencing at the pile near McAllister Industrial Park. Monitoring has and is being performed after rainfall events.
- 24-11 A request will be made of the Fire Chief to make a presentation regarding the public safety issues and emergency response planning. This action will be added to the table of outstanding action items for follow-up.
- 24-12 Copies of the report were made available for those who wished to obtain copies.
- 24-13 Item carried forward to the table of outstanding action items (wetland compensation).
- 24-14 Surface water will not be diverted from the streams north of the Proud Road as the ditches installed for the new road will follow the natural topography of the land.
- 24-15 The request was turned down due to the nature of the testing.

### **Offshore Presentation**

John Logan of Canaport LNG gave a presentation on the offshore work, including the work that was performed in 2006, along with the upcoming work proposed to begin in March 2007. The presentation is included within the minutes. As a result of the presentation, the following questions were raised.

Q8. Why are the temporary piles considered to be an improvement in the pier design?

A8. John L. commented that the new temporary piles installation method for the construction of the pier will provide more precise information (such as the depth of the overburden material on the rock, and other geological conditions). The new method will also eliminate the requirement for the installation of rock mattresses for the majority of pier jackets resulting in less impact to surrounding environmental habitat, and it improves the installation time for the pier.

Q9. What is the typical sand depth (i.e., overburden on the rock)?

A9. The rock increases and the sand depth decreases closer to shore.

Q10. What is the allowable level of noise during the pile driving?

A10. The allowable level of noise is 65 dBa from 7:00 am – 10:00 pm, and 60 dBa from 10:00 pm – 7:00 am for a 1-hour equivalent sound level.

Q11: Is all the work on the pier components being completed in Saint John?

A11. The work that can be completed in Saint John is being completed locally. Some work, due to size and technology for example, is being completed in Newfoundland and Quebec.

Q12. (David T.) What about the concerns of the fishermen and the outstanding compensation issues?

A12. (John L.) Regarding the construction phase, CLNG are working with KWS to determine the equipment required so we will know the area required and the potential impact. Regarding the operations phase, CLNG are discussing issues

with the pilots to determine ship routing etc. All of this is required to have an understanding of the impacts on the fishermen prior to the resolution of the compensation issues.

A motion was put forward by Teresa D. and seconded by Alice B. that the CCELC recommend that Canaport LNG (Irving and Repsol) sign a letter of agreement to compensate the fishermen due to the LNG Project. This motion was carried.

Action item 25-3: Warren will speak with Gary Bishoff and Donovan Case about sitting down with the fishermen to begin dialogue on the issue before the next CCELC meeting.

## **UPDATES**

### **NBDENV Monthly Status Report**

David P. presented the committee with the Environmental Compliance Status Report for August 2006. This report was provided to the members at the meeting. For copies of the report, please contact David Peterson from DENV or Fundy Engineering.

As a result of the report, the following questions were raised.

Q13. Will the aggregate material from Red Head Mountain be used for more than just the road?

A13. (David P.) The aggregate source is on Canaport lands. An expanded use as a quarry would not trigger an EIA, but would require city approvals.

Q14. (Denis G.) How much water will be used for the tank pours and how will this be controlled?

A14. (David P.) Flow meters have been installed to measure the volume of groundwater used for the manufacture of concrete, ground water use can not exceed 50 cubic meters per day. If the volume does exceed the allowable allotment, an EIA will be required to be registered for the greater use of water from the site. Monitoring wells have also been measuring the water table level onsite. A water storage reservoir has been constructed using a PVC liner to hold sufficient water to complete the continuous pour operation. It is being filled at an allowable flow rate.

Action item 25-4: Report on the water volume required to construct the LNG tanks.

Q15. (Teresa D.) Why is work going on at 9:30 PM on the new Mispes Road?

A15. (David P.) There are no time restrictions for the hours of operation. Consideration will be given when working near residents.

Action item 25-5: Co-ordinate an LNG and Mispes Road site tour for September 30, 2006 at 10 AM.

**Other Issues:**

Emera Brunswick Pipeline representatives provided a brief update on the status of the public hearings and answered a number of questions.

The NEB will be touring select sections of the proposed pipeline route to obtain first hand knowledge regarding the impacted properties. Below are some of the questions raised by the committee.

Q16. Can you speak on your security management plan and potential exposures in a post 9/11 world?

A16. Emera participated in a pilot to a new approach with the NEB and scored pretty well on field security and IT system issues. The pipeline controls and design exposes the pipeline to a minimal threat as a desirable target of attack.

Q17. How are landowners responsible for the right of way easements as it relates to pipeline damage?

A17. Landowners are under no obligation, but are encouraged to report any trespass.

Q18. Did the route layout consider local market industrial demand?

A18. The route did not consider this, only the best route was chosen for safety and constructability.

Q19. Why not use the existing MNE pipeline as the connection facility?

A19. The option is too expensive and the pipe size would need to be increased.

Q20. How do the environmental standards in Canada vs. the USA compare?

A20. It is difficult to say how they compare. The Emera environmental manual is available for review on the Emera Website.

Q21. Can you comment on the explosion in Maryland and the gas type etc..?

A21. The Maryland pipeline was 80 years old although it have not been proven that it was due to pipe failure. In addition, we must meet certain gas specs in our tariff agreement.

Q22. Why is Brunswick pipeline filing as a group 2 company?

A22. This is a single use contract to transport the gas to the USA, and this has been the case since the project was first registered.

Q23. If there is a rupture at or near the terminal and the Red Head Road, will there be an alternative route out for residence?

A23. There are no plans for an alternative route. Other emergency measures options would likely be available (i.e., helicopter, etc).

Q24. What would the implications be on real estate on the pipeline route?

A24. Easements are listed on title at the Provincial Land Registry office.

**Adjourned:**

9:30 pm

Submitted by:  
Fundy Engineering

**Next Meeting Date:** Monday 16 October 2006

**Attachments:**

Table of Actions/Responsibilities –September 2006  
Table of Outstanding Action Items (September 2006)  
Traffic Update – August 2006  
Offshore Presentation

## Table of Actions/Responsibilities – September 2006

Action #	Action	Responsible Party	Due Date
25-1	Obtain further clarification from Repsol on the LNG import licensing requirements and the process in Canada	Canaport LNG	16 October
25-2	Review the EIA document and summarize the list of changes related to the design of the LNG Facility, how many and what they are	David Peterson	16 October
25-3	Warren will speak with Gary Bishoff And Donovan Case about sitting down with the fishermen to begin dialogue on the issue before the next CCELC meeting	Warren Long	16 October
25-4	Report on the water volume required to construct the LNG tanks	Canaport LNG	16 October
25-5	Co-ordinate an LNG and Mispic Road site tour for September 30, 2006 at 10 AM.	Fundy Eng / Canaport LNG	30 September