

May 16th, 2012

To: The Joint Review Panel

Northern Gateway Pipelines Inc. (Northern Gateway)
Enbridge Northern Gateway Project (Project)
Hearing Order OH-4-2011

Re: Procedural Conference

The following, in order, are my responses to the questions asked by the JRP.

1. I will participate in the conference by phone.
2. The location of the panel should include Kitimat as it ***is the community experiencing the highest impact from the project -land and marine***. The citizens of Kitimat need to have the opportunity to hear the proceedings and how it will potentially impact their future. Accommodations can be provided in Terrace with bus transportation provided if needed and this is standard practice for other large events. Air travel into Terrace/Kitimat is reasonable with good transportation to Kitimat. Rupert has some exposure to the project but to justify that the hearings take place there due to adequate facilities, that it is central and has reasonable transportation access is not valid. Rupert is not central for the Northwest and the issue of getting from the terminal to the city by ferry is hardly reasonable.
3. The proposed schedule seems adequate. For intervenors with limited financial resources any length of stay outside their own area can be difficult.
4. I have a question directed to my oral evidence- is the reply due within the outlined time framework?
5. There are issues that need to be addressed within the communities highly affected i.e. Kitimat
 - Routing: through the tunnel and the difficult terrain of the Kitimat River,
 - Siting of the marine terminal,
 - Safety, accident prevention response related to the terminal and marine transportation, environmental effects on the estuary, Douglas Channel and marine route.
 - Socioeconomic and environmental effects are different across the entire pipeline. To address them in one place does not allow for adequate participation by intervenors from other areas to address the areas that are

of concern. A significant number of intervenors are without funding and are privately involved in the process. The hearings have to acknowledge this.

- Aboriginal interests are unique to different areas and the costs for travel to one place would be a burden.
 - Consultation with the public needs to be represented in more locations. The public that has been involved as intervenors do not have resources to travel. The panel needs to consider this.
6. I anticipate questioning, Northern Gateway, government of Canada and the BC provincial government. Issues range across a variety of concerns but the focus will be marine. Length of time unknown.
 7. The use of the panel sounds interesting but not sure how one would interact with the panel. More details are required.
 8. Technology is limited as I am rural and do not have high speed internet. Could the use of local video conferencing facilities be utilized.

The panel needs to consider that there are many intervenors that are independent in the process and do not have resources to participate that others may have. It bears on the JRP to ensure there is the ability of all to participate in the process in a reasonably fair and equitable way and the panel needs to consider other ways to configure the hearings

This project is a complicated entity with land and marine components. Further breakdown of the approach to issues would be beneficial

Cheryl Brown