

January 08, 2003
Imperial Oil Ltd. (Mackenzie Gas Project)
meeting on the draft Work Plan

For Imperial Oil Ltd. (Mackenzie Gas Project) Randy Ottenbriet, Peter Grout Wayne Shalagan, Regulatory Legal Advisor, Nezam Amoozegar,	For MVEIRB Vern Christensen, Martin Haeefe Roland Semjanovs
---	--

PG: Imperial is reluctant to leave the hard copy of the current project schedule behind to be placed on the public registry. However, they will speak to it, but won't hand it out.

Discussed the project scheduling which they indicated was similar to that contained in the Preliminary Information Package (PIP) with the exception that 2009 should be shown as the startup for pipeline operations. The PIP shows 2008.

Applications to the National Energy Board will be submitted in June 2004. However, there are questions as to whether Imperial will file for the gathering systems in advance of submitting their environmental impact statement. The EIS won't be filed until the terms of reference (ToR) is finalized.

RO: Reiterated that timing for permits was critical because they are concerned they will lose one winter's work and this would effect their overall bottom line. The original cooperation plan called for 8 months between the submission of the PIP and referral to EA. Under the draft work plan, this schedule now extends 15 months. Companies are now concerned as well that if the first activities are taking twice as long, they then have doubts as to the ability of the Boards to deliver the rest of the process in the time outlined in the cooperation plan.

Draft Workplan

PG: Companies are concerned that the workplan has a six month timeline when there was a four month line in the cooperation plan and that this timeline may extend even longer. Companies had assumed that participants to the cooperation plan would hold to the schedule outlined in the plan.

The second concern is that public hearings are being considered when the companies assumed that public hearings would only be a part of the Joint Review Panel process. They see it as a duplication of effort which the cooperation plan was designed to avoid.

Companies are suggesting that the Board go to a paper hearing process instead. Alternatively, the Board should hold regional hearings if they need to validate information.

Breadth of Scope

PG: Companies are concerned over the wording of some scope items and feel some are too expansive and would be outside of the MVEIRB's mandate to investigate such as steel mills in Japan. They felt that environmental field studies should be excluded from the scope of the EA.

MH: Distinction is being made between what is required to design the project versus what is required to build the project. Activities that are required to design the project such as field studies are excluded from the EA.

Role of Developer

PG: Concerned that the roles for the developer in the EA doesn't distinguish much from Phase I and II.

Other concerns

PG: Suggestion that wording should be made clearer in some sections where a specific phrase is used. It's not clear whether the wording is used in a general sense or it's used in terms of a specific definition within environmental impact assessment.

RO: work in the Gwich'in area begins next week. Access agreement is in place for Good Hope. Close to signing in Tulita. However, it is unlikely there will be work in the Tulita district this year.

As for Deh Cho, waiting to hear from the MVLWB. Not clear whether companies are legally required to have access agreements before geotechnical work goes ahead. Discussions with Deh Cho were suspended to early January. The field work is expected to be completed by winter of 2005-2006

PG: Concerned over how the public hearings would be conducted. Getting input from community is one thing; providing a forum for interrogation is another matter.

VC: Prehearing conferences could be set up for Hay River and YK to set ground rules for these hearings.

January 7, 2004

Re: Meeting of January 8, 2004 with MVEIRB Staff to discuss DRAFT Work Plan (dated December 18, 2003) for the Environmental Assessment of the Mackenzie Valley Gas Pipeline Project

Mackenzie Gas Project Attendees:

Randy Ottenbreit
Peter Grout
Nezam Amoozegar
Wayne Shalagan

Items for Discussion:

1. Review of Mackenzie Gas Project Current Schedule Summary ✓
2. Impact of Work Plan schedule on the Cooperation Plan schedule ✓
3. Proposed public hearing process as contemplated in the Work Plan
4. Breadth of Scope of Development in the Work Plan
5. Breadth of Scope of Assessment in the Work Plan
6. Role of Developer in the Environmental Assessment process
7. General and clarification items

MGP - WSS