

09 May 2014

To: National Energy Board  
444 Seventh Avenue SW  
Calgary, Alberta, T2P 0X8

Attn: Sheri Young, Secretary of the Board

From Neil Syme, Intervener  
hsyme@telus.net

Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC-Trans Mountain Expansion Project  
File no. OF-Fac-Oil-T260-2013-03 02  
Hearing Order OH-001-2014  
Information Request No. 1

As a long-term resident of the Westridge neighbourhood I would like to first and foremost express my concern and dissatisfaction with the process of filing this response. The ability to easily access and query Kinder Morgan's (KM's) report, compile the response in the required format, and ultimately submit the response as per the specifications has been extremely difficult and time consuming especially as a medically-challenged, technology-challenged Senior.

The majority of this neighbourhood consists of a Senior population that has limited access and familiarity to these specifications and technology which has resulted in their inability to respond to these findings. Given this information it leaves me to question the validity of the "public consultation" process that has taken place and the decreased level of responses that will be tendered by Interveners.

## **1.1 transportation**

### **reference; A3SOR1;**

ref info from NEB file OF-Fac-Oil-T260-2013 02

info request letter dated 15 April 2014

Application Volume 2, Project Overview, Economics and General Information,  
Appendix A-Direct Written Evidence of Steven J. Kelly, IHS Global Canada Limited:

1) Figure A-9-Western Canadian Supply for Pipeline Export vs. Pipeline Capacity,  
PDF, page 48 of 230

11) PDF page 48 of 230, lines 16 to 18

### **preamble;**

- references address a surplus capacity of the pipeline.
- we have been told by Kinder Morgan ("KM") that the 3 docks are needed to start up all at the same time because of their "performance model" it says on page 48 of 238 that they will not be using full capacity until 2030. KM have told me in April 2014 that they have to build all 3 docks now and have them running before they shut down the existing dock for demolishing. This, KM says, sets the design parameters and they have used this on the design as submitted.
- in the proposed dock design, 2 of the 3 ships and loading berths would be located in front of my Westridge neighbourhood in full view.

### **request;**

- justify why you need 3 berths at this time; it may be possible that 2 berths is all KM needs at this time. This may allow a more amicable ship location to be considered for our neighbourhood.
- how many ships per month do you forecast from 2019 thru to full capacity?
- how long does it take to receive, load, discharge a ship using the 30" pipe?
- what is the percentage of usage KM expects of for the third dock in 2019 and 2030?

## **1.2 markets**

### **reference; A3SOR1**

#### **preamble;**

- the reference states that overall demand for crude is forecasted to decrease.
- if the facility is to start with a lesser capacity it would seem prudent to have a 2-berth terminal at this time which would allow more design options that would allow lesser impact of the residents of Westridge. If there actually is a lower demand for the product in the future it could stay as a 2-berth facility.
- the existing dock could stay in operation for the low volume of barge jet fuel unloading giving an added oil throughput buffer. It should be noted that the existing dock had an upgrade about 5 years ago. Decreasing the construction would result in less neighbourhood disruption and ghg emissions from construction.

#### **request;**

- does KM have actual guaranteed oil contracts for the duration?

### **1.3 marine and ghg emissions**

**-reference;** A3S4J7

**-preamble;**

- the reference estimates increased emissions from marine traffic; why haven't port Metro-Vancouver been proactive regarding ship emissions and noise levels when they support a green policy for the port?
- KM have produced an emissions study which shows how the emissions will increase due to a 425% increase in tanker traffic.

**-request;**

- why is KM not insisting that ships welcomed at their facility must be equipped with the latest technologies?
- why is KM not insisting shore power to the ships eliminates at ship generator idling to lessen emissions and noise?
- why is KM not insisting biodiesel fuels for the ships and tugs to lessen the emissions?
- In neighbourhood discussions KM has indicated that only 5% of the ships have shore power connections, our environment needs to be treated with the respect of innovative leadership, is 5% of ships seen as being respectful to the environment?
- the tanker traffic is to increase 425% but the KM study shows only a 200% increase on carbon dioxides, please explain.
- KM have produced an emissions' study which shows how the emissions will increase; please submit a study showing how KM can substantially reduce emissions.

## **1.4 dock location**

### **-reference; A3SORO**

#### **-preamble;**

- KM have decided to expand their facility west and locate the major portion in front of the Westridge neighbourhood.
- KM have produced a sound level study which shows how the proposed new dock locations will transmit increased sound levels into Westridge, however, they have not done any studies on how to curb increased sound levels; please provide these studies.

#### **-request;**

- the Westridge neighbourhood have met with KM numerous times and asked to expand east away from the neighbourhood to an uninhabited area, and exchange the water lease with Burnaby; why don't KM seem aggressive with this idea?
- what will KM do to ensure the sound levels from the proposed, closer facility are at the same or a decreased level as those from the existing location?
- provide alternate dock layouts that would respect Westridge privacy that KM have investigated.
- produce a study on how to eliminate increased noise levels because of the increased proximity of the facility to the Westridge neighbourhood.
- provide an independent property assessment for each of the 120 houses in the immediate Westridge vicinity detailing the potential property depreciation as a result of:
  - the pipeline project
  - the dock location
  - the visibility of the dock location
  - the increased sound levels
  - the increased emission levels
  - any other factors that can be attributed directly back to the KM pipeline that could negatively impact residential property values
- provide each home-owner with the above independent property assessment and a proposal on how these costs will be offset by KM.

## **1.5 alternate pipeline routes**

**- reference; A3SOY8 / A3SIL4**

**- preamble;**

- KM have selected, as one of their options, from the Burnaby tank farm to the KM Westridge terminal via Hastings, Cliff Ave.

**-request;**

- justify a pipeline route that would:
  - encircle a neighbourhood with only one exit/entrance to the Westridge area of 120 homes.
  - go thru the Burrard Inlet conservation area.
  - disrupt the single exit/entrance access point for traffic to the Westridge neighbourhood on Cliff Ave for the construction of a two 30" pipeline corridor.
  - go thru a one access, single exit/entrance point for emergency equipment.
  - go thru existing storm, sewer, natural gas, water, and jet fuel pipelines.
  - go thru two substantial Metro-Vancouver storm and sewer pumping stations.