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(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 8:35 A.M.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, before we begin, we have two problems this morning. One we've corrected with the technical problem of getting the presentation on the screen. It seems like the sound -- or the system seems to go to sleep on weekends here, I think. But that's been fixed.

The second thing, which is probably even more important, is $I$ understand coffee has just arrived. So if you want to just quickly take a, take a stroll back to get a cup of coffee, please do so. I'm going to grab one myself. So we'll resume in just a minute.

## (BRIEF BREAK)

THE CHAIRMAN:
Good morning, Ladies and

Gentlemen. I'd like to begin now. And thank you for the -- bearing with us for the, the few delays this morning. But we are now ready to start.

I would like to welcome you all back for these proceedings, and particularly on a Saturday morning. We thank you for joining us to assist us in, in working through the proceedings today.

We're going to begin this morning with presentations by the two Panel experts, beginning with Mr. Woosaree, followed by Dr. Whidden, and then we will begin the cross-examination process after that.


Mainland Reporting Services Inc. courtreporters@shawbiz.ca

## Objectives

I was contracted by the Joint Panel, Joint Review Panel to provide advice with regard to analysis of impacts, reclamation planning, proposed mitigation measures, conservation of rare plants and ecosystem integrity.

I have been working on native plant development and habitat restoration for the last 20 years. And I am here today to determine if there was enough information in the EIS to meet the requirements of a JRP, and with regard to environmental effects of the proposed Project and the, and the significance of those effects.

Project Description: Infill Drilling Development Project

We all know what the Project is about. And one of the overarching questions, given the sensitivity of Suffield NWA, should -- and the high density of species at risk, if the Project should go ahead, what level of development can this ecosystem sustain?

## Observations

What I will do, I will make a few observations with regard to the EIS and the submissions received from the various intervenors and then I will highlight some of the major points raised
during the hearing process and make some recommendations that have potential to mitigate some of the effects should the Project go ahead.

With regard to the EIS, there were some uncertainties regarding environmental effects and cumulative effects.

There were also uncertainties regarding effectiveness of mitigation measures from the Project activities and also with regard to a species at risk and their critical habitat, and also to some of the wetlands setback distances, and viable population of indigenous species that might be affected.

And the EIS was not perfect, but this is what this process is about, with technical information session provided on -- in February 7th and 8th, and with various Information Requests we do have adequate information to gauge potential effects of this Project.

And with regard to the major intervenor submissions, we have concern with regard to spread of invasive species, protection of critical habitat for endangered wildlife and plants, conflict with over-land uses with regard to Military, Military training, oil and gas, livestock and wildlife.

We have some compliance issues that we'll
raise. Lack of baseline data were also reported and also, there was a lack of a management framework for the Suffield NWA.

We've -- we heard a lot about benchmark data. I came across some -- a couple of places in the minutes of SEAC that -- where there were benchmark data being covered.

And what I brought forward here, like, Alberta Sustainable Resources Development was governing benchmark data for Suffield. I don't know for how long, but in their Annual Report, every year you will see benchmark survey for, for Suffield area.

What you see from this slide is the legal land description, the type of soil, and the species, plant community species and the various composition and also the amount of vegetation and bare ground and so on.

So when we talk about benchmark data or we look at measurement of effectiveness of mitigation, this is, this data set is something we can use trying to compare with, trying to relate to, in order to, to gauge success when mitigation is used.

There were over-indicators which can be used, talking about reclamation, or in this case, it should be more like restoration.

Yesterday we heard about some question being raised about indicators, like what are the indicators we need to measure if -- when, when the disturbed sites is revegetated? A particular example, what $I$ put here, is some of my work in the fescue grassland.

And when the indicators can, can be many, but like in this case, we look at fescue as a major plant community and in this case, it can be like rough fescue, in this case it's 32 percent. We have various plant habitat -- plant species that make up this plant community. We have a total vegetation which give us an indication of how much cover will be expected and we also have a rangeland health assessment.

And basically this is a system adopted by Alberta Sustainable Resource Development just to gauge potential effects on a particular disturbed site when it's reclaimed and try to compare it to some of the benchmark.

So the information out there, it's just a matter of adapting it to existing conditions in the Suffield NWA.

The next slide, again, we talk about indicators. And with, with management of the NWA, I believe there should have been a clear plan as a direction we want the NWA to go. And when they are

```
claiming it could be like to measure the effectiveness of a habitat, we talk about -- we can -- about, like, in this case arthropods, frequenting a certain habitat. This can be an indicator. I pulled a couple of paper just to give you an idea. Like in Australia, we use ants to, to measure effectiveness, how successful an habitat has been reclaimed.
```


## Anthropogenic Footprint

We talk about anthropogenic footprint. In the EIS, Mr. Kansas explained about using digitized air photo to, to calculate the different habitat types. Although I agree, but this produced some ideas of a percentage of an area that had been directly affected by human activity.

Pipeline Reclamation in Suffield

But I want to make the point, if you look at the slides, this is a slide I received from Alberta Sustainable Resources a couple of years ago, from Medicine Hat with regard to the Suffield. And this is a particular pipeline that has been seeded to wheat as a means of assisted natural recovery. And from what you see adjacent to the seeded stuff by the harrow right here, it's Crested Wheatgrass invasions. And it happened because Crested Wheatgrass has been used in that landscape for so, so many years and the seeds are
there and they will take advantage of available resources to spread.

So when you talk about the size of a footprint, if you calculate the amount of disturbance caused by Crested Wheatgrass, the footprints, footprint size might be larger. But when, in calculating direct footprint, which was used by Mr. Kansas, it was estimated to be less than 4.5 percent because in the digitized air photo it was about 4.5 metres and in actual -- in reality, it was less than 4 metres, so $I$ would not argue that. It could be less, but we have to take the indirect effects of the footprint which include the spread of non-native species and other weeds. So it might be a little bit larger but that's agreeable.

## Reclamation Plan

Also, when we talk about effective habitat loss, many of the wildlife species, the, the use of wheat will not make any difference in terms of vegetation for them. For example, for the elk and pronghorn, it's not an issue. But for small arthropods who spend pretty well most of their lifecycle in small patches, that could prove to be a disadvantage. So it is appropriate to have appropriate plant species when using the reclamation.

And when we talk about control of invasive species, I believe it should involve all stakeholders, oil and gas, PFRA, and the Government of Canada.

Because in the early years, many of that Crested Wheatgrass and other non-native foragers were prescribed for use in the NWA as a means of soil erosion control. And we see from an exhibition from Alberta Environment, but at some point even Crested, Crested Wheatgrass was endorsed by their department and adopted in Suffield, and later SEAC decided what -- they were not going to seed to Crested Wheatgrass, they were just going to go with natural recovery.

And with natural recovery, when you have a particular landscape being exposed to available nutrients and the resources, there's potential for invasion and Crested Wheatgrass will invade and this is the effects you see right here.

Another point $I$ want to mention is in the Government of Canada report, there were two major reports, by Roland and one by Brent Smith. They talk about invasiveness of Crested Wheatgrass from associated pipelines, but it, it's not fair because they cater only to oil and gas companies. Animals, livestocks move from one hand to the next, Pronghorn
and elk carry seeds, birds carry seeds. I mean, there are many indirect effects. We don't see an indication, but the Military was available when we entered the NWA. I mean, mitigation measures, especially when dealing with the NWA, should apply to all users, Military and non-Military, and all of them have a role to play.

Pipeline Reclamation in Suffield


#### Abstract

We heard about reference to a southern Alberta Sustainability Strategy, with regard to the spread of invasive species. What they don't state is what along the major pipeline corridor in the Foothills, many of pipeline right-of-ways were seeded with non-native species, like Timothy, Brome Grass, and so on. So that's why when you look at the land's habitat fragmentation and invasiveness, you see a greater impact from oil and gas activities. But it should have been noted that much of the right-of-way was seeded to non-native species.


## Reclamation Plan

My next slide will talk about the Reclamation Plan. We use Reclamation Plan vaguely throughout this process. I believe we should gear more towards a restoration plan.

If we have to define what the intended goals are and what should be stated in the National Wildlife Management Plan. Because if we reclaim, it has to be reclaimed to some intended use. And what is that use? Previously like cattle grazing has a major impact on NWA. And if we want to reclaim and the us is towards cattle, cattle grazing, then go ahead, put more Crested Wheatgrass because that's (indiscernible) goal.

But I believe the, the goal, the objectives of the NWA is to maintain or conserve the genetic diversity and therefore we should move more towards a restoration plan, which is even in Colonel Bruce's interpretation yesterday, was to reclaim to some pre-disturbed condition, which in this case, is more like restoration. And if this is the case, then we should use appropriate native seed mixes to do reclamation and monitor for that.

Seeding is one thing; trying to get the plant community to resemble more of its pre-disturbed condition. But after seeding, we need to have a strategy how to manage the non-native species, such as Crested Wheatgrass and other major weeds, like your Canada Thistle, your Brome Grass, your Tumbleweed, Eurasian thistle. So we should have a weed management plan how to deal with those. We cannot just seed and
walk away. And there are times when we need to encourage grazing in order to facilitate the processes so that there's seeded plant materials will be right on a trajectory but will represent its pre-disturbed condition.

From this slide, I think it's a particular pipeline upon my visit to the NWA in February. We see the soil surface to be roughened, which I think it's pretty good, because a rough surface like that, it provides the safe environment for seeds to catch, like especially native seeds, to germinate and grow. And with the soil being the cost actualities (phonetic), it will trap snow, conserve moisture, and at the same time prevent soil from blowing away.

And from several observations, species like Crested Wheatgrass will prefer -- like Crested Wheatgrass will prefer the fine smooth soils where it can invade easily. So to have a site like this one, which roughened will be an advantage to facilitate the vegetation.

Also on my February visit to the NWA, we talk about some native seeds being collected and I did see some plots there. And information collected on testing of these species, whatever they are, would better put to use if that information is shared with the industry because, again, we have to remind ourselves that the goal number one is to protect and maintain the integrity of that NWA.

So I feel that information was not shared freely between the various land users and a management plan will address that.

And by the size of plot, it's not a small plot, looks like, you know, there's quite a few species being tested there.

I will take this opportunity to talk more about reclamation, because that was brought up yesterday about why would harvesting seeds. Wild harvesting seeds, it's okay to collect from some adjacent areas and try to use it as time goes by in the reclamation. But it doesn't give us the diversity we need at time to make it more effective.

And the reason I say that, if you look at our grass community, in this particular area, it's mostly Blue Gramma, June Grass, Western Porcupine Grass, and so on, and some old/new grass. They flower different times of the year. June Grass will flower towards middle of June, early July. The Western Porcupine Grass will flower more towards the end of July and same with Slender Wheatgrass, towards the end of July and so on.

What I'm trying to say, plants have different flowering time. And if you try to do -- harvest hay to revegetate particular sites, you may not capture all the diversity represented in that harvest because of the different maturity. Some of the early species will have shattered seeds. So, If you go too early you miss the late one, if you go too late, you miss the early species.

So that's one of the reason, like when you use native hay, which is being proposed lately in quite a few projects, it has some good, it has some bad.

And also given that the area has a lot of weedy species, you have to find areas what are pretty clean to be sure that whatever you're going to seed doesn't have any of the tumble weeds, your wild mustard, Eurasian thistle, and so on. So this way you try to reduce some of the problems that you might have in the future.

In the past, we did not have too many choices in terms of what species we used in the seed mix. So we used mostly whatever was available on the market and whatever was recommended to industry by various government agencies.

Today we have a better knowledge of what
works, what doesn't work. We have many more native ecotypes available in the market and such species could be used to make a revegetation seed mix that will help accelerate once the site has been disturbed.

During the National Resource Canada presentation, some issues were brought up about soil risks. And $I$ know in the EIS they rate soils according to different risks as high, medium or low. And there's nothing wrong with that.

In fact, for -- though proposing a scientific way to do it, and one of the most common methodology to assess soil rates is by texture. You look at a particular area, you look at the soil texture, look at the amount of sand, silt and clay. And based on those percentage, if it's more clay, the risk is low. If it's more sandy, the risk is high. So you can easily have a system where you can assess soil risk.

So on the national risk analysis, or Natural Resource Canada presentation, I don't know how -- what else -- how else to explain it, but $I$ believe a system, just looking at a texture of soil, help explain the risk associated at a particular site. And it can easily be done in the field.

With regard to EnCana's mitigation technique, I believe that many of these mitigation techniques
will work. I have reviewed the videoclip as proposed by EnCana in terms of how well some of the sites will reclaim. And also the presentation made by Flint Energy were some good examples of successful reclamation there. And if it's put to use, such as matching equipment to terrain, the SpiderPlowing and so on, we might see some good restoration on the way. It's not perfect because the landscape is quite variable, it's quite dynamic, so we cannot just assume that it will be like that for all the sites. But each site needs a special attention and wherever we have a lack of vegetation, we need to address as to why we have a lack of vegetation. Do we have to reseed again or cross seed it? And those attention we have to pay to each of the site.

In terms of traffic control methodologies to protect vegetation, seed bank and soil, we saw the, the use of remote monitoring such as the SCADA has been proposed. My only concern there, that SCADA has been in existence for about 15 years and has been used by oil and gas since. And I would have liked to see some examples, but would have been used in the NWA.

I would like to see more like being proactive rather than have waited should the Project go ahead we'll use this technology, given that the technology
was available 15 years ago. So a little bit proactive would have gone a long way to show that we can more effectively reduce traffic and so on.

And with regard to traffic and, and soils, whatever compaction will have on the trail for the first year or two, this will be it. No matter if you drive on the same trail for the next 20 years, the soil won't be compacted any more than it is, already is. And when it comes to the vegetation, I believe it can be revegetated again by ripping the soil and using some mulchings and so on we can revegetate it.

And recapitulating a little bit about soil risk, in many sand -- soils with highest percentage of sand, it's not an issue of reclaiming. With a combination of mulching, using straw crimping or maybe at times, if possible, we can -- on certain slopes we can use snow fencing to cut down the prevailing wind and to facilitate vegetation establishment.

And, again, $I$ say that we have new native seed mixes that are available now. Our understanding of plant community recovery is much better than before, than 20 years ago.

And we seen for various informations exchange and technical session, even from EnCana, that there is a willingness to control invasive species on pipelines
and so on. But, again, $I$ strongly believe that any willingness to control it, non-native species, should involve all parties because it will be sort of detrimental if one party tried to control some of these Crested Wheatgrass and so on while others don't do anything about it. It won't be feasible and it's not practical. So it should involve all the stakeholders.

And it will be appropriate to know what are some of the critical high risk habitat how. But given like some of the accounts for rare species was not done and so on, in this case, the PDA is a type of pre-adaptive management which is justifiable in this case.

We talked about adaptive management yesterday, briefly mentioning it. And it was referred as a smoke, a smoke glass. It has its merits. Only place where we're not too sure when it comes to critical habitat, because once was species -- we don't know the thresholds. Like whether a number four is enough, or five would have been better, or three is detrimental, as an example.

So this way, adaptive management may have some issues. But other than that, such as in the $P D A$, it is just -- I believe, it is justifiable.

While we talk about EnCana's past reclamation experiences, again, through some of the minutes from SEAC and some of materials mentioned in the EIS, we see some good examples. We know from the analysis of the data in the EIS, we could not see clear correlation, for example, between paired pipelines and native plant, native plant community integrity.

That, that's okay, because many of the pipelines, when they were done in the early days, it was used, it was revegetated using non-native species. And that's why we could not a see clear correlation.

But today we see some good examples and I believe we could have some success if it's done properly. However, some of the sites, but showed poor vegetation cover, increase bare ground, eroded soils, or presence of Crested Wheatgrass, needs attention because now we have better tools, it will be appropriate to go back and try to revegetate those sites appropriately and deal with it.

And with many of the problems found on the sites as brought forward by SEAC and by Mr. Lambrecht with regard to cement and wastes, multiple trails and things like that, that was left of the landscape is, I believe, unacceptable. It should not have happened.

Although we heard during this hearing that

EnCana and -- well, that's the next slide. We heard about covering responsibility from EnCana and Flint Energy Company about how well their people are trained and about some of -- how sensitive they are to environment and how the respect of the environment and the high performance contract, that most people are measured against.

Given what we have seen from SEAC minutes and from Mr. Lambert's presentation, I would urge that we hold some of these people responsible so that in terms of waste and cement and multiple trails and so on doesn't repeat itself again. It should never have happened and $I$ hope it will be taken care of in the future should the Project go ahead.

And with regard to ruts and so on, and multiple trails, sometimes when we see a particular trail of a landscape, it's easy to follow it. But we tend to associate it with oil and gas. But upon my visit in the NWA, it was normal for our driver just to cut through the landscape, same way. When I ask the driver, like, "Don't proceed because of snow. You cannot go ahead." "We do it all the time. There was a trail there last -- just yesterday."

So it appear that we need some clear objectives in terms of trail. If we're going to have
some trail, stick to it. Like, you know, like it's not one rule for the oil and gas and another particular rule is for the Government of Canada, because I am the custodian, I can do whatever I want. It should not be that.

With regard to rare plants, as listed by SARA, those are three of the main species. It will be good to know the location where those plants are found and in what population numbers. And once we understand the biology, we develop the recovery plan -- which I think there, there is a recovery plan for Tiny Cryptanthe and Sand Verbena -- we should look at ways how maybe to propagate them.

To propagate plants and introduces them back into the community is not unusual. It's done throughout the world. Many of the botanical gardens reproduce rare plants and try to establish them again in ex situ garden and where they can be reintroduced into their natural environment.

Here, I don't have experience with Tiny Cryptanthe and Sand, Sand Verbena, but I have experiences with other plants which are considered OS1, OS2. For example, like in this case, it's Sand Begonia which loves disturbances. And when you look for them, the only place you will find them is associated with certain disturbances, like road sites. And with Senate grass, we, we propagate them very easily.

And we have lots of literatures on germination on some of the species of rare plants. And this can be either coal stratification, use of jubilic acid (phonetic), use of ethylene.

So what I'm saying, there are lots of information out there on how to reproduce rare plants. And perhaps it would be appropriate to look at some of the species and see if we can reintroduce them so that they should not stay rare anymore.

When we talk about wetlands, $I$ know there's a wetland policy, No Net Loss of Wetland Policy, with regard to conservation and protection of wetlands. What I tried to show here, despite the policy we have from 1996 from DFO, we still see many of oil well being put near waterbodies. In this case, the top left, right here, is a particular wellhead near Hardisty. You look at this one down here, it's in the Fort Saskatchewan area where a wellhead blew off and it's quite a mess to clean up.

And if you look at this one here, it's -- it
is Jasper National Park. And, of course, it's a National Park and you ask yourself, what is an oil
well doing there? And this one last week I found near an ephemeral area near Vermillion.

My message here, given that we have a policy for No Net Loss of wetland function, I think we should be more diligent when issuing licences so that such scenarios is not repeated again.

For example, in NWA, we hear about well removal from wetland. Whether it's a wetland or not, we can always argue about that. But the point I want to make, that these particular wetland, unless you know the, the critical function in terms of habitat for critical species, it should not be messed with.

So that's why, as a recommendation later you will -- I -- for application in the NWA, either like the Base Commander, one of his representatives, or SEAC, will be appropriate to be along with EnCana to determine where future sites should be.

I make the remarks about "Big Bob" because I saw that particular site. And the wait -- to me it looks more like a constructed wetland ponds, or a construction ponds. And there's always the potential for spill should a pipeline break or spill of gasoline or whatever. And, of course, when, when you are dealing with, with wetland, there's always a rich number of species associated with it. It's rich in
plant. It's very productive. It's a critical source of food for many species.

So, therefore, the further we stay away from them, the better it is. And we hear from EnCana that they will try to adhere to known distances or trying to steer away from any particular wetlands.

And these wetlands are important because there are so few of them in the -- this region, but it serve a very important functions and it gives the landscape character, also.

And when we talk about wetlands, we talk most, mostly about SARA, the species at risk. But we forget two more pieces of -- two conventions; the Migratory Bird Act of 1918 of which Canada is a party. And what this called is for to protect the habitat and environs necessary for bird survival. So that's why areas like "Big Bob" I feel is very important in this dry mixed region to protect migratory birds.

And we also have a Ramsar Convention, which is an International Treaty between a number of countries to protect fundamental ecological functions of wetlands and their economic, cultural, scientific, and recreational value.

So in addition to SARA, we have this convention which our Federal Government signed and I
think we should respect them.
And with critical habitat, once we identify them, we have to stay away until we know their effects upon the particular wildlife. And with activities being in the winter, we don't see some -- I don't see some issues and I think Troy will touch more on that. But to me, I think of some of the animals which spend most of their winter range in the NWA, such as the Pronghorn in this case, and some of the --I think the Prairie Chicken because they were too far away and I could not tell what they were.

## Recommendations

```
    So going to recommendation, I think there are
    some information out there. I know we talk about
doing some modelling. I don't see the value of
modelling because it's all based pretty well on what
you put into the model, but I think we can use the
baseline data if they are there. And I know, like, I
saw there some baseline data and based on what's
collecting every year from the Government, we could
try to gauge some -- to what level of development is
ecologically sustainable in this environment.
                    We should finalize the Environmental Effects
Monitoring Plan to include a management plan, a well
management plan for the Suffield NWA. One with the
```

objectives, timeline, and have capacity building, so that we know who is doing what in, in what timeframe. And any decision with regard to sitings and infrastructures should involve DND and SEAC.

And all -- we should identify all the critical habitats and we heard from EnCana again, but we'll try to avoid wetlands, and I think we should stick to that, because the wetlands are key habitat to wildlife. And complete vericable plant for all species at risk and try to -- and all industry should work together, all land users should be -- should work together.

And also I want to emphasize, because we are working with species at risk, and what liabilities involve should certain species not be able to recover. So that's a question mark. I don't know what it is. But I thought it should be there should habitat deteriorate over time.

Habitat loss and fragmentation can have large impact on wildlife from psychological stresses and it should be minimized wherever possible.

And I believe that mitigation should at best take into account the potential for restoration of the land to pre-disturbed conditions. And that should be specified in a management plan for the NWA, because I strongly believe the goal of the NWA is to protect and maintain the genetic diversity. If it's not that, then we have to define it what it, what it is if it's grazing or not.

So I mention about wildlife in terms of avoiding sensitive areas and did whatever constraint mapping we have to do before any wellsiting is finalized.

I mentioned about management plan again to control invasive species and in order to reduce impacts to the land and to wildlife and the habitat. Regular monitoring is essential. I see from the SEAC minutes and SEAC report that they did a wonderful job with regard to monitoring, but monitoring has to be fair because from the report from what I read, it was more targeted towards oil and gas.

But in fact, when you monitor, it should be more towards all land users, including PFRA, because upon my visit to the NWA, even by -- when walking by the cattle covering or loading area, you could see lots of weedy species. You could see lots of Crested Wheatgrass. So when you, when you monitor, you describe the Crested Wheatgrass invasion and so on, it should include all the activities from all land users, not only oil and gas.

And we should not have any loss of habitat that's critical to species at risk. And because -this is important because many of the small Arthropods associated with a particular habitat, like I said before, for them that little slew or pot or prairie potholes, as we say, on the prairies is representative of their lifecycle and it's very important to maintain that, because once the animal are gone, like -- most likely in the beginning, they will find refuge on adjacent land, but after four years, maybe five years, we don't know the timeframe, but at a certain timeframe, if it disappeared, we are gone, and what cycle is not reversible because animals don't tell us when they go, they just disappeared.

I will re-emphasize about employees receive environmental awareness training during orientation, because from what we have seen before, despite about the high performance standard and the training received, it appears that it hasn't sink for some of the employees by leaving debris on the landscape.

And this should also apply to the Government of Canada because in one of their report, the 2006 Access Report have some recommendation for mitigation and but, and but debris should not be left on the landscape. So I believe maybe they noticed something
on the landscapes in terms of debris that was there and should not be there. And that's why I thought it should apply to all parties, not only one particular land users.

And, of course, employees should be held accountable for non-compliance. And $I$ think we hear from EnCana and others about high performance contract.

Given -- should the Project go ahead, I see a greater role for $S E A C$ and we have to define that role. And that will be part of a management strategy or management plan for the NWA. Right now, it's sort of loosely defined. So I think, if we have a clear management plan, SEAC role should be re-defined again to accommodate the extra load provided by the proposed Projects.

And to be sure what past performance in terms of detrimental effects like well in the wetlands, ruts and so on not being repeated again, and habitats are protected.

And there should be close scrutiny of all project activities with DND approval when it comes to final sitings because, as an example, what we heard from the hearing about wells found in well sites and so on, and $I$ think if, if there is a scrutiny of all
the Projects, we can avoid repeating some of those unfortunate events.

And, again, what are the consequences associated with violating these conditions?

I believe it should not be status quo like we just get a licence, we go and drill. So we should raise the bar when it comes to dealing with the national wildlife. And according to The World [Well] Conservation Conservation Union, a protected area is dedicated to the protection and maintenance of diversity and associated cultural resource, and associated cultural, cultural resources and it should be managed -- there's a mistake there.

But it should be managed through legal and established objectives. And this way I thought we should define what is established objectives in a management plan so that everybody is, is on the same level.

Closing Remarks

```
            And in closing, I strongly believe that
environmental liabilities from source extraction, in
addition to over-land use should not be passed to
future generations. I think we have enough
information to properly mitigate future impact and
some, of course, we'll develop along the way.
```

We should consciously, purposely, protect the biological, functional and genetic diversity, which I think as humans, is what it's all about.

So can the proposed Project be ecologically sustainable? I think with appropriate mitigation, we can do some -- we can reduce or lessen the impact, taking into consideration some of the avoidance of critical habitat, some of the development for recovery plan for some of the species, so we should determine those thresholds and proceed cautiously.

Thank you very much. I think that's the end of my slides. I will pass it on to Troy.

Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN:
All right. Thank you,
Mr. Woosaree. We'll hear next from Dr. Whidden. Yes, please go ahead, sir.
A. DR. WHIDDEN: We just need to hook in here, first.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, just one moment, then, we'll try to get you connected properly.

PRESENTATION BY JOINT REVIEW PANEL EXPERTS, BY

DR. WHIDDEN :
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Good day, Panel Members, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Encana Shallow Gas Infill Development in the

## Suffield National Wildlife Area <br> Wildlife Review

Prepared by
Whidden Environmental Ltd.
A. DR. WHIDDEN:

My name is Troy Whidden and I was hired in late 2007 to review wildlife related aspects surrounding EnCana's shallow gas infill development in the Suffield National Wildlife Area.

EnCana Suffield Review Purpose
Generally speaking, I was hired to assist the Joint Review Panel to fulfill its mandate with respect to wildlife, to make recommendations for management of wildlife, and to address the overarching question:

Is there enough quality information to gauge the potential impacts to wildlife from EnCana's proposed Project in the EIS?

EnCana Suffield Review Objectives
More specifically, I was commissioned to do this by generating two reports independent from the Joint Review Panel. These are -- I don't have the exhibit numbers, I'm sorry, but Wildlife Management Report No. 1 and 2.

Wildlife Report 1

```
    So, within Wildlife Report No. 1, like I
``` said, I was commissioned to advise the JRP on the regulatory setting in which the EIS was formulated with a focus on evaluation of project impacts on wildlife.

Two, I was also commissioned to advise the JRP on the EIS issues, analysis, impacts, and proposed mitigation measures relating to wildlife.

I was also asked to determine the relative level of uncertainty associated with impact predictions and proposed mitigation measures.

And I was also asked to determine how EnCana dealt with potential impacts to and effects on wildlife with a consideration of species of special management concern and Provincially and SARA-listed species.

To summarize, wildlife report No. 1 was generated by reviewing EnCana's EIS.

Wildlife Report 1: Recommendations
I would now like to summarize the recommendations I put forth in Wildlife Report No. 1. Background information, and rational associated with these recommendations can be found throughout the report itself.

Recommendation No. 1 was to facilitate the design and implementation of a formal Environmental

Management Plan for the Suffield NWA. Detailed wildife conservation goals are required to gauge product impacts.

Two, or the second recommendation, sorry, was to facilitate the clarification of the regulatory spider-web covering the Suffield NWA.

The third recommendation was to explain the process behind finalizing the EIS guidelines themselves, particularly in association with the timing of field work completed and the meaningful consideration of stakeholder input into the guidelines.

Number 4. Or the fourth recommendation, sorry, was to request formal guidance for species at risk in the Suffield NWA, including recovery plans and definitions of critical habitat for some species.

The fifth recommendation was to have EnCana discern between V-E-C or, VEC habitat suitability and species at risk critical habitat, while considering or keeping in mind the legal and environmental consequences of their loss.

Recommendation No. 6 was to examine the 'baseline' databases for wildlife to ensure sufficient power for statistical testing in association with any formal or -- or with a -- in addition with any in association with any follow-up or monitoring program.

Recommendation No. 7 was to ensure that the involvement of the Responsible Authority and stakeholders in design and implementation of a monitoring program should the Project proceed.

Recommendation No. 8 was to determine how expected monitoring results will demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures. In particular, have wildlife management targets been reached?

Recommendation 9 was to determine successful mitigation. For example, how will testable questions be developed through monitoring programs to determine whether mitigation has been successful. And to consider what quantifiable approaches will be employed in wildlife monitoring.

Number 10, determine how many PDAs are required and which species would be covered in each. We have covered some of this, I know.

In particular, how would this data that's gathered through the PDA process be used in monitoring project wildlife interactions at the landscape scale.

Recommendation 11, was to consider arthropod species and assemblages as key indicators of environmental impacts to wildlife.

Recommendation 12 was to examine use of Before-and-After-Control-Impact approach to gauge cause and effect relationships, if any, between project activities and wildlife.

13, request detailed discussions and analysis of consequences of linear disturbance on all wildlife VECs.

14, was to obtain additional information on timing of disturbances and linear ranges of ungulates in the Suffield NWA.

Winter timing requires a little more attention and there needs to be acceptable mitigation strategies employed.

15, consider impacts from increased traffic in sufficient detail for all VECs. And potentially consider dust impacts in terms of the assessment.

16, determine why pellet group surveys were not conducted to gauge ungulate habitat use and distance from roads with particular attention paid to Pronghorn.

Recommendation 17 was to not permit dugouts or water holes to be constructed in or around wetlands. There is potential for disruption of hydrology and hydrogeology.

Recommendation 18 was to clarify the

Environmental Construction Reporting System that was presented by EnCana to ensure that SEAC sees all environmental reporting documentation and that relates to clarifying Figure 2 of the Environmental Protection Planned, EPP.

\section*{Wildlife Report 2}

\begin{abstract}
So, secondly, I was also commissioned to generate a report to advise JRP on formal hearing submissions submitted by -- submitted in response to the EIS, which was filed by EnCana. And I was to advise the JRP on supplemental submissions and Information Requests with a focus on intervenor positions related to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

These submissions included -- or the aspects reviewed included submissions by DND, Environment Canada, submissions by the Environmental Coalition members, submissions by SIRC and SEAC, a variety of Information Requests, and many supplemental submissions.

As with the first wildlife report, a series of recommendations were made to the JRP based upon these submissions, and their contents. Background information and rationale for these is provided in the report. Some of these recommendations are not mutually exclusive from the recommendations in the
\end{abstract}
first Wildlife Report. And I'll go through those now. So, again, Wildlife Report No. 2 was based upon the review of all, all the intervenor submissions, essentially.

Recommendation 1 was to ensure that past, present and future surface disturbance in the Suffield NWA is quantified.

Number 2, when considering potential effects to SARA-listed species, other wildlife species and their habitat consider the ecological context or the fact that we're looking at an NWA here, or that an NWA is involved.

Recommendation No. 3 was to clearly define the PDA review and assessment process. The PDA process should not be a substitute for systematic surveys. PDA is nothing new in the environmental assessment industry. But given the sensitivity of the area we're dealing with, the process itself needs clear direction and definitions.

Recommendation 4, address the outstanding issue of regulatory guidance from Federal or Provincial representatives.

Recommendation No. 5, was to determine and publicize why Alberta Environment and ASRD have not acknowledged responsibility to the ecological
resources to the Suffield NWA.

Recommendation No. 6 was to suggest that SEAC be provisioned with resources to monitor NWA user activities should the Project proceed.

Recommendation No. 7 was to suggest that SIRC work with SEAC in monitoring oil and gas activities in the NWA if the Project proceeds.

Recommendation 8 was to consider the scientific certainty of impact predictions related to wildlife.

Recommendation 9 was to facilitate the design and implementation of environmental management plan for the Suffield NWA. As Dr. Ross said yesterday, "The devil's in the details" and goals for a wildlife conservation need to be formalized.

Recommendation 10 was a requirement for a clear definition of sustainable ecosystems within the NWA and this should be done by the RA for all NWA users.

Recommendation 11 was to streamline and clarify regulations relating to grazing, fire suppression and hydrocarbon activities in the NWA.

Recommendation 12 suggested the systematic investigation of the impact of roads, traffic, and trails on wildlife in the NWA.

Thirteen was to have all wetlands in the NWA delineated and classified. This information could be used to facilitate avoidance and mitigation by all land users.

Fourteen was to ensure that EnCana demonstrated mitigation effectiveness from its past activities should it involve the gathering, analysis and application of empirical data.

Fifteen was to determine the number of PDAs required and the surveys required in each PDA. And again, to consider how this information could be used to monitor project wildlife interaction should the Project proceed.

Sixteen, again, suggesting an increase in SEAC staffing to accommodate the obviously increased workload due to the Project proceeding, including revisiting SEAC's role and mandate.

And, again, suggesting that detailed discussion and analysis of effects of linear disturbance on all wildlife VECs.

Request more information on the impact of winter oil and gas activities on winter herds, including antelope, elk, mule deer and white-tailed deer.

Consider the impact of increased traffic in
detail for all VECs.
And, finally, do not permit dugouts or water holes to be constructed in or around wetlands for reasons of compromising wildlife habitat and hydrology and hydrogeology, potentially.

So, my next three slides, I believe they summarize and capture the primary overarching issues surrounding uncertainty with EnCana's proposed EIS. As outlined in part, in Intervenor submissions, in relation to wildlife management in the Suffield NWA.

So, again, these overarching comments I believe capture some of the main -- or a lot of the main, the detailed issues.

\section*{Summary}

A detailed management plan for the NWA is required and it should include specific conservation goals, objectives and targets for wildlife and wildlife habitat.

There needs to be a close scrutiny of all project activities under any approval conditions.

Follow-up and monitoring program details are required if the Project proceeds. For example, how will mitigation success be gauged?

All parties need to be aware and expect a heightened attention in effort in designing mitigation
measures.

And, finally, the PDA process needs to be reviewed and finalized should the Project proceed.

The proposed PDA process (including management framework) requires input from the ERA, SEAC, and the JRP.

So, in conclusion, I would like to come back to the original overarching question of:
"Is there enough quality
information to gauge the potential
impacts to wildlife from EnCana's
proposed Project in the EIS?"

This is not an easy question to answer in terms of providing an all encompassing answer or single solution. Uncertainties exist in the EIS with its conclusions surrounding wildlife that are unacceptable to many parties.

However, the main point that I would like to draw the Panel's attention to and others is that without a formal management plan, it remains difficult now and it will remain difficult in the future to gauge the success of wildlife management in the National Wildlife Area.

And that's all.

THE CHAIRMAN:
Thank you, Dr. Whidden.

We'll now begin the cross-examination and -- sorry. MS. LaCASSE: Mr. Chairman, I think there's a preliminary question or two that we need to ask these two witnesses for the purposes of the record. THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and please go ahead. MS. LaCASSE: Mr. Whidden, I'll start with you, were exhibits 009-002, your February 8 submission, and 009-006, which is your August submission, Exhibit 009-004, which is your response to Information Request, and 009-009, which is your curriculum vitae prepared by or under your direction?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Yes.
Q. And do you have any corrections to those documents?
A. Not that I'm aware of. Other than a few typos.
Q. Okay, all right. And is the information within those documents accurate to the best of your knowledge?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you adopt those exhibits as your evidence in this proceeding?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Woosaree, were exhibits 009-001, which is your February 18th, '08 submission, 009-005, which is your August 15th, '08 submission, Exhibit 009-003, which is your reply to Information Request, and

009-007, which is a reply to request from the Government of Canada, and Exhibit 009-008, which is your curriculum vitae, prepared by you or under your direction?
A. MR. WOOSAREE: Yes.
Q. Okay. And do you have any corrections to those documents?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And is the information in those documents accurate to the best of your knowledge?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you adopt these exhibits as your evidence in this proceeding?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm actually going to ask one other preliminary question, Mr. Chairman, and I'll start with Mr. Whidden again.

Mr. Whidden, the following clause was included in your service contract for this Project and I'm just going read a little bit of it to you:
"The role of the contractor is to
provide independent expert analysis
and recommendations to the Joint

Review Panel. However, recognizing
the nature of the joint review
process, the contractor shall have no direct contact with the Joint Review Panel and all subsequent communications from the contractor [which is you, Mr. Whidden] following the execution of the service contract shall be in writing

I would just like to confirm that you've complied with this contract in that you haven't communicated directly with the Panel members; is that correct?
A. MR. WHIDDEN: That's correct, yes.
Q. Okay. And Mr. Woosaree, I have the same question the for you, is it correct that you have not communicated directly with the members of this Panel?
A. MR. WOOSAREE: You, that's correct.
Q. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. LaCasse.
We can now begin the cross-examination and we would start with -- no, I see the Coalition, Environmental Coalition does not wish to cross-examine. Then I'll turn next to Government of Canada, Mr. Lambrecht, please.

Mr. Lambrecht, before you begin, we should mark the two presentations from the Panel Experts as
exhibits. And I would give Mr. Woosaree's presentation, the slide document, Exhibit 009-010.

EXHIBIT NO. 009-010: Curriculum Vitae of

Mr. Jay Woosaree
THE CHAIRMAN: And Mr. Whidden's, Exhibit 009-011.

EXHIBIT No. 009-011: Curriculum Vitae of Mr. Troy Whiddens

THE CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, BY

MR. LAMBRECHT :

MR. LAMBRECHT: Gentlemen, thank you for coming today and trying to help us and the Panel with the difficult issues we've got to address here.
Q. There are a couple of general questions that \(I\) wanted to ask, ask you in order to sort of get a better sense of, of the material that you've had to look at prior to your attendance here today.

So I thought maybe I could just ask of -- one question and then invite both of you to answer in any sequence that you wish. And that is, to what extent have you had an opportunity to review and consider the materials that have been, and the, the documents and the testimony that has been given to the joint Review Panel since it commenced its proceedings on
about October 6th?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: I can answer that for myself. I attended the first week of hearings, October 6th through until the first week was over, the 10 th, \(I\) believe, and \(I\) had the opportunity to access all of the hearing transcripts, which were made available as, as they became available.
Q. Although you had an opportunity to access them, did you have an opportunity to review and consider them?
A. To review and consider? In part, yes. It depends when they came up and, you know, a couple of hours of going through them at night usually looking at wildlife information. They didn't make it in to my presentation in terms of -- it did add to -- some things were amplified and there were a few new things that came up which I noticed which I wasn't aware of.
Q. And what about some of the documentation that would have been provided to the Panel during the course of the hearing? A number of exhibits were entered that are new to the record.
A. Yes. And depending upon what it was, I would have to look at the transcript to see about the context of the documents that were -- at least I did -- that were submitted.
Q. All right. So you would have had a chance to review
some of them?
A. To review all of them, sorry.
Q. Oh, you did review all of them?
A. Nothing that was submitted last -- I was here yesterday, so I didn't look at --
Q. But everything before?
A. As far as I'm aware, yes.
Q. Okay, thank you, sir. And Mr. Woosaree?
A. MR. WOOSAREE: Likewise, I, I was here on October 6th, October 10th. And after that I have -- I had an opportunity to review the transcript, most of them, except the last two days, which was Thursday and Wednesday, due to computer crash, but what, what -- I reviewed most of the transcript. I, I reviewed some of the presentation by National Defence Canada. I reviewed some of the documents which was entered as exhibition related to reclamation and Crested Wheatgrass and so on.
Q. Okay, so let me ask each of you in turn -Dr. Whidden, perhaps I'll start with you, and then turn to you, Mr. Woosaree.
A. Sure.
Q. Based upon the information that you've heard, since you prepared your reports, do you still stand by and support the reports that you have filed? Are the statements in those reports still accurate?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: They were accurate at the time of their preparation.
Q. And are they still accurate today having regard to what you've heard?
A. The majority would be. But I'd have to go through them in, in detail.
Q. M'mm-hmm. And Mr. Woosaree?
A. MR. WOOSAREE: Yes, they, they are accurate.
Q. So you would adopt and support the statements in your report?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes. Okay. Mr. Whidden, perhaps I might ask you some general questions about the PDA process, if I might, and then turn to a review of your report.

Would it have helped you in the work that you were asked to do by the Panel to have the PDA work done at this moment?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: At this moment, as in right now. You're saying?
Q. Yes, in other words, if the environmental assessment provided to the Joint Review Panel had included the work that was proposed to be done in the PDA process, so that would be the -- there would be surveys for wildlife and plants. There would be preliminary well
and trail sitings, and there would be proposals for how to place the wells within the various constraints that might exist, would that have helped you in your work if that PDA work were done now instead of in future?
A. Short answer, yes, but the examples also helped with gauging what they were going to do.
Q. Mr. Woosaree, what do you say about that? Would the PDAs have assisted you if they were completed now?
A. MR. WOOSAREE: Yes, it would.
Q. All right. Mr. Whidden, can I ask you to pull up your report. Let's start --
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Give me one minute. Oh, sorry, which report was that?
Q. Let's start with the report of February 2008, which is 009-002.
A. Okay, I've got my own copy in front of me, sorry.
Q. All right. Can I ask you to turn to page 10. And under heading number 1, the -- you make the following comment:
"The GOC..."
I understand that to be Government of Canada.
```

"... request, to provide the

```
scientifically sound baselines, see
comment number 2 below, is


Mainland Reporting Services Inc.
disturbed by the proposed Project.
It appears that the information provided lacks basic scientific principles."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you still stand by that statement, sir?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: In part. Additional information was provided by EnCana.
Q. Could we maybe address some of the surveys that EnCana may have done?
A. Sure.
Q. I'd like, in particular, if I could, to talk about the breeding bird survey. Now, my understanding is that there was no survey done for the Burrowing Owls, is that your understanding?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. All right. So you would still stand by this statement with respect to that species?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Can \(I\) ask you to turn to Appendix 5J, the breeding bird survey.

I'm sorry, sir, I don't happen to have an exhibit number for this one. If you'll just give me a moment, we'll be able to pull it up on the screen.

Exhibit 002-110. And it's Appendix 5J. Exhibit 014, perhaps, 002-014. Did you examine the methodology for the breeding bird survey, Dr. Whidden?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. I just want to make sure that \(I\) understand what is presented in this material. Now, do you understand this to be, under 5J(1), a general description of what EnCana did in terms of a breeding bird survey to prepare its EIS?
A. Yes, but I believe this was -- this particular approach might have been mandated in the guidelines.
Q. Just so that \(I\) am clear, two field surveys were done in the period 1 to 13th June, 2006. So two field surveys in a period of two weeks in 2006?
A. Yes.
Q. Plus a point count survey and a second point count survey?
A. Yes. I don't have the details in front of me that you're reading from.
Q. Do you have any reason to think that this is inaccurate?
A. No. No.
Q. All right. Now, you've heard some of the -- I take it you would have heard some of the criticism of the survey methodology adopted by EnCana in respect of wildlife during your review of the materials?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Let me take you back to your report of February 2008, Exhibit 009-002, at page 12 this time. And I'd like to go to this second-last paragraph under heading number 4. I'd like to read you the following statement and ask if you still stand by it:
"EnCana's apparent reluctance to conduct adequate statistical analyses, including the power analyses, and consideration of sample sizes requested by GOC, is disappointing and disenchanting. If the lack of proper power analyses is typical for Canadian Environmental Assessments as EnCana argues, then the typical assessment is inadequate indeed."

So do you still stand by that statement.
A. Yes, with the caveat they did provide additional analysis regarding the power of some of the data collected.
Q. Yes, and I don't want to engage with you on that --
A. Neither do I.
Q. Yes. What I understand you're saying is that while

EnCana attempted to bring forward some analysis on some data, otherwise your opinion here, you stand by that opinion today?
A. Yes.
Q. Let me ask you to turn to page 15, at the second paragraph, and I'm going to read you the following statement. It says:
"This is why the benchmark of natural range of variation is not a good parameter for predicting impact significance. We provide the suggestion quite aside of fact that natural variation has not been quantified by EnCana. Therefore their claim that a given effect is within the natural range of variation is flawed."

Do you still stand by that statement still today, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Can \(I\) ask you to turn to page 21. Under the heading "Fragmentation", and I would like to read you the first phrase:
"Habitat fragmentation was not
assessed."

Now, when \(I\) read this in your report, sir -- have you had a chance to read that paragraph, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. What I understood you to be saying in the phrase that I read out to you is that habitat fragmentation was not assessed in the EIS. Did I understand that correctly? Am I interpreting that correctly?
A. I believe it was considered but then they -- there was some discussions around the actual widths of the linear disturbance.
Q. Considered and assessed; are you using those terms in the same sense?
A. I'll say yes.
Q. Now, I'll come back to this, then, in the, a moment. But the final sentence, you go on in that, in that to say -- let me just read this out to you:
"Habitat fragmentation was not assessed because it was not considered to be a key issue for the Project ..."
        I'm sorry:
            "... because it was not considered
            to be a key issue for the Project
            as disturbance from pipelining
            would be less than two metres for
```

well tie ins and less than four
metres for loop-lines these widths
were considered insufficient to
result in habitat fragmentation
effects however these claims remain
unsubstantiated and lack any
provision of rationale related to
the potential impacts to all VECs,
large and small, from linear
disturbances less than four metres
in width on the ecological
integrity of the NTA."

```

Do you stand by your statement, sir, that the EIS conclusion that these widths were insufficient to result in habitat fragmentation effect remain unsubstantiated and lack any provision of rationale related to the potential impact to all VECs from such disturbances?
A. At the time the report was written, yes.
Q. Yes, and today, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. May I ask you to turn to page 29, and the last paragraph?
A. Okay.
Q. I'd like to -- I will read to you a sentence and I'm
going to invite you to comment on the verb that
you've chosen; \(I\) think it's a verb:
    "In addition, it is imperative that
    all environmental reporting during
    construction, operation,
    decommissioning and abandonment
        phases be transparent."
    Now, the word you used was "imperative" here, And
that's a very strong and powerful word. I'm wondering
what you envision as a transparent output from all of
this environmental reporting? If your recommendation
were adopted by the Panel, and I'm a member of the
public, what would I be able to see and how would I
see it?
A. I believe this sentence was made in reference to the policing of activities in the NWA. We have heard some evidence where not necessarily everything is coming forward that happens in the NWA with respect to trail access, what have you.

I believe that's where \(I\) was going with -given the context of the area and the sensitivity of some of the habitats, and wildlife species, the idea of everything coming forward to whoever or whomever is policing the activities, the public needs to be assured that everything is coming forward.
Q. All right. And let me, let me take you to, then, page 33 of your report. And this goes to the question of setting the bar for environmental assessment in a National Wildlife Area. I'd like to read the final sentence of your report under Section 5.1:
"Heightened attention to and effort in designing mitigation measures and alleviating project effects should be expected in light of the proposed Project occurring in a globally recognized National Wildlife Area." Do you stand by that statement today, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And above, in that paragraph, the following statement appears:
"The overarching question, 'Is
there enough quality information to
gauge the potential impacts to
wildlife from EnCana's proposed
Project in the EIS?' guided this
review report. Additional
information is required in several
instances."
```

            Do you stand by those two sentences today --
        those two sentences today, sir?
    A. Yes.
Q. May I ask you to turn to your second report, August of 2008. It is Exhibit 009-006. And I'd like to turn to page 6, under Recommendation No. 2. Now, this is the August 2008 report. When you prepared this, sir, did you have an opportunity to see EnCana's reply of August 13th, I believe it is?
A. No. That was reviewed post this report.
Q. All right. That's helpful to me. Under Recommendation No. 2, you state the following:
"We concur that evidence supporting impact redistributions was not provided in many instances. See Wildlife Report No. 1 for specific details. There is a heavy reliance on unproven or questionable mitigation strategies and several species at risk were not assessed for systematic surveys." Do you still stand by that view today, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And can I ask you to turn to page 14, under Recommendation No. 38. You're responding to a DND

```
recommendation, and I'm just going to -- I'm, I'm going to read out your response:
"We agree with this recommendation.
Several conclusions relating to
wildlife in the EIS appear to be
based more on subjective
professional judgment than actual
filed data or model results."
A. That should say "field data", I'm sorry.
Q. No problem. So with that modification, do you stand by that statement today?
A. Yes.
Q. There's a similar comment with respect to cumulative effects at page 15 under recommendation 32. I'm going to read out, again, your response to the recommendation:
```

"We agree that the Cumulative
Effects Assessment for the wildlife
VECs was inadequate. The Proponent
did not undertake a Cumulative
Effects Assessment for all
terrestrial wildlife species listed
on Schedule 1 of SARA as all
environmental effects on all
species at risk VECs were predicted

```
                as not significant or negligible.
                These projections were generally
                not based on quantitative data or
                were based on insufficient data and
                subjective professional judgment."
                Do you stand by that statement today, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. So perhaps I can take you to your recommendations, which were set out in the slide that you provided today at 009-011. Under Wildlife Report No. 1, Recommendation No. 3.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm just going to wait for this to be projected up on the screen, if it's -- it won't be on the screen? Oh. I'm sorry.

One moment, Mr. Chairman, we'll deal with some technical issues here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. LAMBRECHT:
Q. All right, Mr. Chairman, this particular document is the slide presentation that Dr. Whidden used in the course of his presentation. It's not available to be projected?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it has not been entered into the registry because it's just been received at this point.

MR. LAMBRECHT: Right. And I do intend to ask just a very brief series of questions respecting this and I'm afraid it just won't be able to be projected.
Q. But I think Dr. Whidden, you've got it and the parties have it? So can I ask you to turn to No. 3, Wildlife Report No. 1. I'm afraid I didn't understand what you were trying to say here. So I need to ask for clarification.

There's a question mark behind the phrase, "Timing of EnCana fieldwork", and I, I just don't know what you're referring to here.
A. Oh, sorry. I'm not looking at the correct ... Okay. Number 3 was a request to explain the process behind finalizing the EIS guidelines. My understanding, and I may be incorrect in this, was that the guidelines would be finished before fieldwork was engaged.
Q. All right. Now, just let me be clear about this if \(I\) could, when you talk about EIS guidelines, you're talking about the guidelines prepared by the Joint Review Panel for the preparation of EnCana's EIS for the purposes of this proceeding?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Do you know when those guidelines were finalized?
A. Not the exact date, no.
Q. All right. And then the Question: Timing of EnCana's fieldwork, am I to -- let's take the fieldwork with respect to the bird surveys, those two weeks in 2006. Am I to understand that that fieldwork was done before the EIS guidelines were issued?
A. As \(I\) just said, \(I\) can't recall the exact date off the top of my head when those were issued.
Q. So what do you mean by this phrase, "Timing of EnCana fieldwork" question mark?
A. As you just described, I was questioning at the time I prepared this of -- not just, not just that survey in particular, but all of the wildlife field components, were, were they done before the EIS guidelines were finalized?
Q. All right. And why in your mind is that material?
A. To me, the construction of the guidelines should have in part guided what was done in the field.
Q. All right. That's helpful. Thank you, sir. May I ask you to turn to Recommendation No. 11 under Report No. 1. It says:
```

"Consider anthropod species and
assemblages as key indicators of
environmental impacts to wildlife."

```

questions of Mr. Woosaree and then I'm done. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please proceed.

MR. LAMBRECHT:
Q. Mr. Woosaree, \(I\) wanted to ask you first about the comment you made with respect to harvesting of seed of species listed in SARA in order to re-propagate those species as an element of the Reclamation Plan.
A. MR. WOOSAREE: No, not as an element of the Reclamation Plan. I said there's no harm, once you develop the recovery strategy, looking at the biology of the plants, there is no harm if you want to look at harvesting and propagating them as a means to enhance their population and that practice is done worldwide.
Q. Right. And so in Canada, would you agree with me that that -- the practice of harvesting the seed of a plant species listed in Schedule 1 of SARA would require a permit under the Species At Risk Act and that that permit would be to harvest the seed for the purposes of scientific research in order to prepare a report which would demonstrate the efficacy of the use of that seed in the population?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. All right. And then \(I\) have a second question for you.
A. Can I add more information?
Q. Yes. Of course. Yes.
A. Yes, you do need a permit to meet the requirement of SARA. That's not an issue. It is, yes. But in 2002, I did have discussion with Dave Duncan on a personal note, we met in Calgary, and \(I\) was discussing that issue with him. And at that time he told me that Environment Canada is looking into propagation of rare species and they were working with Dinnerberg (phonetic) and Shawn Greenhouses as based out of Saskatchewan.

But it was on a personal note. But given that you raise the question, it was considered by Environment Canada at that time, and SARA wasn't an issue at that time.
Q. You would agree with me that this technique is not discussed at all in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared by EnCana for this Project?
A. No, it's not, because you need a permit now with SARA. But what I'm suggesting as an option to look at propagating rare species. I don't see anything wrong with it. And in fact, I, I can pull so many papers to justify that.

If you look at the website for the
consultative group in agricultural research, which is based in Netherlands, you will have data set on genetic resources and propagation and harvesting
protocols, is well demonstrated. Only in Canada are we behind.
Q. So, if I understand you correctly, you're saying that this is a well-accepted principle worldwide?
A. It is.
Q. And you are accepting my proposition that it's not referenced in any way in the Environmental Impact Statement filed by EnCana for this Project?
A. No, I don't think it's there, if I can recall correctly, it's not there.
Q. It's not there, is what you're saying?
A. No. But what, what I'm saying as a strategy for the future, if you have a management plan for the NWA, maybe it's worth looking at.
Q. I appreciate your point, sir, and I'm not arguing with it.
A. I'm not arguing. I'm just pointing the facts.
Q. May I ask you to turn to your slide presentation.
A. Sure.
Q. And it's a slide headed, "Reclamation Plan", and it has a photograph of roughened soils surface on it.
A. Yeah, m'mm-hmm.

MR. LAMBRECHT: Mr. Chairman, I think it's the 11th slide in my materials, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. LAMBRECHT: And it has a picture on -two pictures; one on the left of roughened soil surface and one on the right of Provenance testing.
Q. Now, Mr. Woosaree --
A. Yes.
Q. -- from my review of EnCana's EIS --
A. \(M^{\prime} m m-h m m\).
Q. -- documentation, in total, and from what I understand of the evidence that was tendered throughout these proceedings, no one has ever suggested, in any way, that a roughened soil surface should be incorporated into the Reclamation Plan for this Project. Have you seen any discussion in any of the materials anywhere, either filed or in the public record in this proceeding that discusses the use of roughened soil surface as an alternative measure in a Reclamation Plan?
A. No, but when \(I\) saw that picture on my site visit, it looks rough. And \(I\) was trying to point out the advantages of preparing a site for seeding. Conventional methodology, if you have to seed a site, it's to prepare a site, cultivate it, pack it, make it smooth.

And what had happened in the past, you have a more tendency for weeds to get established this way.

So when I saw this site, I thought this could be an advantage for native species to establish easier and it is a disadvantage for non-native species and from experience, it's -- we have made several observations from experience, but a roughened surface is an advantage to establishment facilitate native species. And if you read about Crested Wheatgrass they like a fine surface to get established. Maybe this is a means to discourage it.

And also a surface like, that it traps snow, so it can prevent erosion. So those observations upon my visit I made.
Q. I understand. But what I'm trying to say is that this alternate means was never discussed by EnCana in its Environmental Impact Statement or in the evidence before this Panel. Do you agree with that observation, sir?
A. Yes, I agree with that.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Woosaree. I don't have any other questions?

MR. LAMBRECHT: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lambrecht.
I'll now call on EnCana, Mr. Denstedt, please.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ENCANA, BY MR. DENSTEDT:

MR. DENSTEDT:
Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm moving a little slower today than I usually do. Good morning, Gentlemen, Dr. Whidden and Mr. Woosaree, thanks for coming out today and, and helping us out. I expect, Dr. Whidden, you and I spent some time in Fort McMurray together. I see it's on your resume; there were a bunch of projects that may have overlapped.
A. DR. WHIDDEN: A brief amount of time.
Q. Yes. A couple questions just to start. And my friend took you to Appendix 5J of the EIS. And if Mr. James could bring that up.

And he asked you about the surveys that were done. And again, I was a little confused by his question, so I'll, I'll see if we can sort it out here.

I thought he indicated that there were -- to you, that there were only surveys and from 1 to 13 of June of 2006, but in fact, if you go to the second page of 5 J, to page 4 , it refers to another set of surveys that were done 17th to 28th of June. You were aware of that, right, Dr. Whidden?
A. Aware that we missed the last page or aware that --
Q. No, that there were additional surveys done, contrary
to what my friend suggested.
A. Off the top of my head, no, but I would have to look at the documents and cross check my reports. It's been a while since \(I\) looked at that particular passage.
Q. Yes, I understand that and there, there's a lot of material filed on the record so I don't expect you to have a detailed memory.
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. But on page 5-4, if you could bring it up, Mr. James -- it indicates that there was a second set of surveys done on 17 to 28th of June. You had no reason to doubt that that's true?
A. No.
Q. All right. Thanks. And Dr. Whidden, my friend also asked you about fragmentation. And I think you'd agree with me that when EnCana submitted their reply evidence, they actually contained a section on fragmentation and its impacts, didn't they?
A. There was, yes.
Q. Thank you. And while we're in the reply evidence, I think you'd agree with me that when EnCana filed its reply evidence, that it also included a section on Arthropods?
A. Yes, there was a section.
Q. And, Dr. Whidden, is it fair to say that if you'd had a chance to review in detail all the transcripts and I think the 30 -odd additional exhibits that have been filed, that that may in fact have influenced your recommendations?

If you knew back in February what you know today, it might have influenced your recommendations, is that fair?
A. The ones made in the first Wildlife Report and the second Wildlife Report?
Q. That's correct.
A. To a certain degree, yes.
Q. All right. Thanks. And Mr. Woosaree, one question for you.
A. MR. WOOSAREE: Yes.
Q. My friend suggested to you that a rough and messy ground surface doesn't appear anywhere in the evidence. But that's not correct. Dr. Walker actually said in the Opening Statement:
"A rough and messy looking ground surface worked better than one which was smooth and neat looking." And that's page 98, line 10, of the transcript. And you may not have been aware of it. Again, there's been a lot of information and a lot of evidence filed.
A. Yeah.
Q. But subject to check, I think we'd both agree that if it's in the transcript, that it is in front of the Panel; is that fair?
A. That's fair. Yeah.

MR. DENSTEDT: That's all I have, sir.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Denstedt. I don't believe there's any other of the -- or no other parties that wish to cross-examine this time. Then I'll turn to the Secretariat. Ms. LaCasse, please?

MS. LACASSE: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if \(I\) could have one minute with the staff just to discuss where we could go from here. It may shorten things significantly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Sure. Please do.

MS. LaCASSE: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE SECRETARIAT, BY MS. LACASSE:
MS. LaCASSE: I'm not sure we are going to shorten things quite as much as some of us would have liked but \(I\) will try and keep things moving.
Q. I'm going to start with you, Mr. Whidden, if I may. In your first report, you commented on the lack of an integrated management plan for the NWA. Is it your recommendation that this plan should be obtained before any construction starts on this Project?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: That was not one of my specific recommendations.
Q. Okay. But is it your recommendation now? Has that changed?
A. Ideally, it would be beneficial to have the plan before anything had happened, not just this Project.
Q. Okay. And do you have any recommendations for the Panel about what the key elements or content of such a plan would be?
A. With respect to wildlife and wildlife habitat, specific detailed conservation goals.
Q. Okay.
A. Sorry, those targets or goals could be used to assess the results of monitoring programs and mitigation measures.
Q. Okay. And I'm not sure if this is an appropriate thing for you to answer, but do you have any comments about the use of -- experimental use of fire for ecosystem management in the NWA?
A. That might be more along my colleague's expertise.
Q. Okay. All right. Thank you. In your first report, recommendations 8 and 9 deal with monitoring follow-up activities to validate the success of impact mitigations. And that was I think recommendations 8 and 9.
A. Okay, yes.
Q. And you note the importance of statistical
significance when testing mitigations.
A. Sorry, remind me where that was again?
Q. I think it was recommendations 8 and 9 on page 34 and then you note on page 12 of that report the importance of statistical significance when testing mitigations?
A. It talks about using quantifiable approaches, yes.
Q. Okay. In its Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan, EnCana's proposed a future process with a small number of candidate programs. Does this
information -- are you familiar with that document?
A. I did have an opportunity to review that, yes.
Q. Okay. Does that information in the EEMP address your concerns regarding follow-up monitoring?
A. Well, the details would need to be worked out, specifically what they are looking at and what, what the objectives are.
Q. But you agree with that process, that would satisfy you?
A. The general process, yes, but, again, the details are required to make any kind of judgment.
Q. Okay. And Mr. Whidden, or Dr. Whidden, rather, pardon me, do you see a need for the EnCana habitat
suitability or resource selection function models to be validated for NWA use?
A. I'd prefer to use a term "evaluated" as opposed to "validated". Ground-truthing, yes.
Q. Do you have any experience or knowledge of successful environmental management plans for protected areas that include industrial activity?
A. Personal experience? No.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of any?
A. Not off the top of my head, sorry.
Q. In your first report on page 17 under the heading "Wildlife Seasonal Sensitivity", you identified a concern about the number of different seasonal mitigations for wildlife species and what mechanism of field coordination would be used.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you satisfied this concern has been addressed in EnCana's EPP?
A. I'd have to pull the EPP out again and take a look at it again, but \(I\) know it was an issue when \(I\) brought it up here, and I know others brought it up. If they are, and I'm assuming they are outlined in the different seasonal constraints that are outlined in the EPP, the implementation of it is the important part, not so much having it on paper.
Q. Okay. How could complex scheduling of time sensitive mitigations be addressed to ensure compliance? Are you able to comment on that?
A. It's a complicated matter. I mean, you've said it yourself. There's a lot of things going on out there, and there's a lot of critters out there and -- that are sensitive at a wide variety of times. There are -- there is some overlap, but it's a bit of a planning nightmare.
Q. Okay. In, I think it's actually both of your reports, you talk about ungulates and pellet group surveys.
A. Yes.
Q. And EnCana's provided additional wildlife information relating to pellet groups surveys. And I believe there was a survey and analysis conducted on behalf of EnCana and set out in its Reply Submission.
A. There was.
Q. Okay. Are these sufficient to support their conclusions in their EIS of insignificant impacts?
A. I'd have to look at the actual context of that conclusion of insignificant impacts to what, in particular? Are we just going to stick in a species name, it's a little too generalized.
Q. Okay.
A. I'd have to revisit the details again.
Q. Would it be helpful if we considered one species, like the antelope? Does that assist you in giving the Panel some information?
A. Feedback on, on his reply?
Q. Yes.
A. Essentially? Sure.
Q. Okay.
A. Again, I'd have to get it in front of me to remind myself, because it wasn't part of either of my reports, but \(I\) did review it.
Q. Okay. Maybe we can do that. Do you need five minutes? Or perhaps we could carry on. I could talk to Mr. Woosaree and then come back to that question.
A. Sure, I mean, \(I\) don't have the document in front of me.
Q. Okay. We'll get that for you. In terms of mitigation of snake mortality, EnCana's proposed scheduling of construction in winter and having reduced travel speeds. Do you think these are going to be effective ways to mitigate that problem?
A. Could you repeat that again?
Q. Okay. In relation to snake mortality and mitigation of that, EnCana has proposed scheduling construction in winter and having reduced travel speeds for vehicles. Do you feel these two things will be effective ways to mitigate snake mortality?
A. In part. It depends -- there's a lot of details to that overarching statement.
Q. Okay. Are there any other mitigations that you can suggest that EnCana should employ?
A. Well, I think we heard some of them in terms of avoiding areas near hibernacula and high crossing areas, high movement area.
Q. EnCana hasn't recognized high suitability habitat for its wildlife VEC to be equivalent to critical habitat.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay? And what I'm wondering is, how, in your view the preliminary critical habitats mapped by Environment Canada should be considered by the Joint Panel in reviewing this project? How should they be treated?
A. How should the preliminary assessment?
Q. Yes, the preliminary critical habitats mapped by Environment Canada, how should this Panel treat those?
A. Well, they should be considered. In my opinion, it would have been nice to have the critical habitat designations and delineations done a while ago, but this is the pathway forward, I think. It's gotten a
lot of people -- the process we're in today, it's got a lot of people's attention and we're finally moving -- or some people are finally forward on finalizing those things.

So in terms of how the Panel should consider them, they should value their input to date. And, but also the final ones, the devil's in the details and you need the final ones.
Q. Okay. I think Mr. Lambrecht talked to you a little bit about this, but the indirect effects of the project, such as fragmentation and loss of habitat effectiveness have been concerns for intervenors relative to the EIS. So should there be additional assessments of these impacts within the NWA?
A. It wouldn't hurt.
Q. Okay.
A. But there's always a chance of more information not -meaning nothing more, but there's also a shedding -the possibility of more information shedding new light on things.
Q. Okay. I have a feeling you're not going to want to answer this, but what species or methods might you propose for this further assessment?
A. Well, you've got a list of 48 plus VECs you could choose from.
Q. Okay.
A. And there's been recommendations or some intervenors have suggested the possibility of looking at some other ones.
Q. Okay.
A. So --
Q. And methods?
A. For the linear disturbance? Again, there's a wide variety you could choose from, I mean, EnCana's presented some. We've heard some from other intervenors as well.
Q. Are there any that you would recommend? No?
A. I -- I can't. I'd have to sit down and look at the details and all the different recommendations that are put forward.
Q. Okay. Are there any -- in your view, are there any key wildlife species that merit more consideration when you talk about the 48 VECs?
A. That aren't listed as VECs?
Q. Well, even within the ones that are listed?
A. Well, I think \(I\) made some of those points in my reports regarding the Burrowing Owl and potential selection of Arthropods or assemblages for consideration.
Q. Can you provide any information to help the Panel
understand the likelihood or the extent of habitat avoidance for species at risk such as, say, the Sprague's Pipit?
A. The likelihood of habitat avoidance?
Q. \(M^{\prime} \mathrm{mm}-\mathrm{hmm}\).
A. Of what?
Q. As a result of the Project.
A. I'm not a Sprague's Pipit expert. I think we heard from one of the ladies yesterday about the perceptions and how they perceive habitat. I'm not in a position to judge every single specific species.
Q. Okay. Are there any specific ones you could help us with on that?
A. In the case in point -- in the case that we're looking at here with linear disturbance, maybe some of the smaller bodied ones. Ord's Kangaroo Rat, for example, smaller ranges.
Q. Okay. When you recommended the use of Arthropods as indicators in this process, how do you see this being accomplished? How would you follow through on that recommendation? Are you able to help us?
A. Well, there are some species that I know the Government of Canada was looking at, but there's also other ones that -- there is a candidate list that's been presented and there's things that you could look
at in terms of the viability of actually doing it. It's not always done. And it hasn't been done that commonly in environmental assessments in terms of looking at non-vertebral species. It's, it's a detailed process. You have to sit down and weigh the options, number one, if you do want to do it or not.
Q. Okay.
A. It's, it's complicated.
Q. All right. Mr. Whidden, I'm told that that's enough for you. So I'm going to move on to Mr. Woosaree and I'll be back to you on that one question.
A. Thank you.
Q. Mr. Woosaree, in your first report, you commented that native range integrity measures could be improved by the use of a reference condition.
A. MR. WOOSAREE: Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, in its reply to intervenors, EnCana outlined a protocol of rangeland functionality. Are you familiar with that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you able to comment on this protocol of rangeland functionality as a proposed reclamation standard?
A. For rangeland functionality, it's based on site
stability and function, like in terms of erosion control and what's the intended use of that site. So, in terms of rangeland control, like, if you're monitoring, you have know what are you monitoring for. I mean, monitoring is a good exercise, unless you have some clear direction in terms of what your objectives are and what you want to monitor.

So if you want to monitor for vegetation success, when you have to pick what species are you after, what, what was your climac species, or you want to look, look at early species and then look at trajectories.

You could look at your productivity of a site, how useful it is for grazing, for example, or how frequently it's used by wildlife. So these have to be defined in addition to site stability and function.
Q. So do you think that's lacking in the protocol?
A. I can't remember all the details of the protocol.
Q. Okay.
A. But one thing which clicked to mind was the site stability and function. I mean, when the site is disturbed, if you look at the picture I showed, by seeding it -- by not seeding it, when -- you are exposing the site to erosion. By seeding it to a
particular plant, you do provide function and that function is site stability, you are providing cover.

And like I said, for deer or elk, that particular weed crop will not make a difference. But if you're looking at arthropods or particular birds, it does make a difference, because we are saturated with certain type of habitat.

So that's why you want to have clear directions, like what do you want to monitor for? And that has to be determine, determined by the stakeholders, who are -- whether it's DND or it's EnCana, I'm hoping that it wasn't be specified in a particular management plan, but everybody's said this is how we do business, so we'll be targeting and this is our goal.
Q. Okay. So do you think there's any way to tell whether this protocol of rangeland functionality will achieve ecological restoration?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. Okay.
A. Like I said, you could look at your vegetation composition, you can look at the amount of litter, what does -- what litter tell us, where is decomposition happening, decompositioning supposed to be in a cycle, where different bacteria, microbiology, microrise associated with this, so you could look at your amount of weedy species present. So there's a number of ways you could access.
Q. Okay. Would you recommend that the reference or control sites be undisturbed native prairie or successfully reclaimed sites or could they be both?
A. It has been to be undisturbed. And in that particular example I showed from Alberta Sustainable Resources, you, you see two slides, one in the ungrazed condition, which are exclosures, just to, to show you what it is. And then one in the grazed condition because we have to accept the fact that cattle grazing and livestock grazing is occurring. So if you want to make then the range, to what condition do you maintain it? So this gives us a guideline as to where we want to measure our success.
Q. Okay. In your first report, you talked about your review of the EIS and intervenor materials and the poor management of operational and post-construction impacts.

And you mentioned specifically rutted ground, weeds, waste disposal and reclamation. You suggested that if mitigation proposed by EnCana was implemented, many of these concerns would be addressed.

I'm just wondering, given the inspection process outlined in the EPP, is anything further required to ensure that the measures will be effectively implemented? Like, would you need a third party audit, or anything like that?
A. CEAA does a good job, but anything, it's not frequent enough. Like, I, I gather that it's about once a year they do inspection. It's not enough.

Despite the best intention of providing training to the people, but at the end of the day, we are human beings, we tend to take short cut. And by having debris on the landscape and taking different trails and so on, it's just human nature which should not -- never have happened because we're dealing with an NWA.

Can these be prevented? Yes. Maybe like an environmental police type, you know, like will be make them more compliant. What's reliability if we don't obey? So -- and the third party audit, you know, will be more -- will be -- will help, too.
Q. Okay. EnCana has spoken to the use of low disturbance construction methods and project scheduling as major mitigations for impacts to native prairie. And they have talked about using SpiderPlowing, chain ditching and construction during dormant periods. They have
also stated that pipeline construction using trenching and chain ditching could extend into April. What I'm wondering is whether you consider that the impacts from this kind of construction, the trenching and chain ditching, would be low disturbance in nature?
A. I think they will, because I, I have seen the Spider-Plowing in Ramzi Ecological Reserve. I have seen it in some public lands, what's native, and after a couple of years you could hardly tell that a plough has been there. But the only concern when you have that, it's invasion by non-native species.
Q. Okay. What about the lateness of the season, constructing into April, how do you feel about that?
A. The lateness, like for vegetation like by beginning of April, middle of April, vegetation is start to green up already, so I mean, this is -- if it's going to happen up to end of April. But during the winter it's dormant, so I don't see an issue when they are dormant, because once you put the vegetation back where the soil has some root materials and so on, and with a mulch they are supposed to sprout.

When it comes to April, like that's the time they are greening up, so if you disturb them at that time, you might lose some, you might, you know, maybe some survival, some loss.
Q. I just want to clarify, the comments you've just made, are those in regard to SpiderPlowing or are you talking about trenching and chain ditching as well?
A. Trenching, if you talk about the narrow trench, even that in about three, four years you have a short recovery. And you can hardly tell that we have been there. Like I said, your only threat will be invasive weeds.

SpiderPlow, after couple of, of years, you cannot tell that it has been there. I've seen two examples and then when I saw the picture again, like, and I have also talked to some landowners from my experience, who have various industries where they have done SpiderPlowing on their land, because we have pastures and nothing had happened.
Q. What about a 2-metre width for a ditch, trench?
A. Well, you are scraping your topsoil, and when you take your surface topsoil, you pile it there, there's nothing wrong where -- like, as you said, later when you bring it back to the surface again, all your plant materials and so on are still there, your seed and seed banks, everything are still there. They are not going anywhere.

So taking advantage of the environmental
condition, some will germinate, some won't germinate as usual. But given the threat that weeds like, again, and your species of concern, which is Canada Crested Wheatgrass, it will be advantageous to seed to reduce that, to give them some competition so that you won't have to face that weeds issue again.
Q. Okay. Are there any mitigations or specific things that you can recommend for the Panel for lessening impacts with that kind of 2 -metre ditch with a trenching and chain ditch method, is there anything in particular that you would recommend with regard to that method of construction?
A. I don't know much about construction. But \(I\) have seen some examples where vegetation success has been quite dramatic in a short timeframe. But only concern when you -- with SpiderFlow (sic), like if you do it in winter, it's the frost. It depends how, how much frost you have in the soil. And I think if it's more than 6 inch, you may get a situation where it will sheer the soil, where you will have greater disturbance in normal straight line.

But that, the construction in general has to work that out with the condition of the soils at that time. That's my only concern.
Q. In your first report, you recommended that alternate
analysis of EnCana's vegetation triangle sampling should include ordination analysis?
A. Yes.
Q. And you identify concerns about the small sample size and recommended power analysis?
A. Yes.
Q. Since then, EnCana's responded by doing ordination analysis and discussing a power, power analysis in its intervenor submissions.
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with those?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Given this information from EnCana, do you have more confidence in its conclusions that increasing well density to 16 wells per section has negligible effects on native prairie?
A. After -- with ordination analysis I was hoping to see some kind of correlation between well density and native prairie integrity. And with ordination analysis, we haven't seen that. It is a power analysis, but we haven't seen it because when you look at the graphs, it's all so many dotted -- it's scattered all over the graph, and you cannot make a clear conclusion.

But given that, even if you don't see any
clear differences, nevertheless we should continue to make a very efforts to mitigate or to reduce the impacts from well density. And if the sites are adequately vegetated, \(I\) don't see it should be an issue.
Q. Okay. In your first report, you commented on the limited baseline environmental data for non-impacted areas and the need to establish thresholds for existing activity and proposed activity.

And EnCana's approach has been to assess disturbed areas of \(16-\) and 8 -well density for differences. Can you suggest what environmental thresholds might be developed for the proposed Project?
A. I was concerned about rare species, especially wildlife, like -- although that was not my area because many of critical wildlife or wildlife on a species of SARA list, it will be nice to know what are the critical population level. And that's where \(I\) was getting. Because with these species, once we are gone, we are gone, we don't tell us what -- we are leaving. You know, like you and I will are leaving we don't say that to us, they just disappeared because there's a lag period between -- for a species to respond.

Like I said, most of the species like would have take refuge on adjacent sites in the short season. But if the site is not adequately vegetated within a short timeframe, those species might be gone. So I was concerned about that.
Q. Okay. So I think in your second submission or report you stated that you support the concept that research is needed to determine how birds and other small wildlife populations are affected and rare plants adjacent to pipelines. Do you think this kind of research needs to be conducted prior to any further development in the NWA?
A. Again, we'll go back to the -- a management plan again. And the reasons when we evaluate success of reclamation, we have to know what metrics are we looking at.

And one of the intended use will have Arthropod association or bird association with the reclaimed sites. So if a site is adequately reclaimed to its vegetative components, the next step to be sure what of wildlife birds or bird nests or what, whatever is making the reclaimed site way home.

And if you see signs of these, then you know you're on the right track. And if nothing is happening, yeah, you can say you have habitat, but
guess what, nobody's home.
Q. Okay, thank you. New information has been provided by EnCana and that was in its Reply Submission, Appendix \(J\), as a model for its PDA process. During its evidence, EnCana stated that it would utilize existing soil survey mapping data for desktop analysis and field siting of wells and pipelines.
A. Yes.
Q. So it appears there will be no ground-truthing of soil information at the PDA stage. In your opinion, Mr. Woosaree, is the soil information based on the 1 to 50,000 level survey adequate, or is site level soil sampling also advisable before finalization of construction plans?
A. I think in addition to their desktop data when they are doing the PDA, we can look at adverse sensitivity of the soils. Like I said, soils can be easily assessed in the field based on texture and percentage of sand, silt and clay and based on the slope.

A slope, you know, like we consider greater than 15 percent to be highly risky, in this case. So I think it can be done at the PDA to be incorporated into the soil data.
Q. In your August report, you recommend that setback distances proposed for conservation of species at risk be adhered to by EnCana.
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. Are these setbacks for wetlands and temporary wetlands, both?
A. Yes. But the reason I brought setback distances, because we don't want a situation where we still find wellsites to be, to be found in wetlands given the importance of wetland.

Wetlands, like I said, serve critical habitat for grazing, livestock, and insects, birds, and so on and so on. And given the conventions regarding preservation of wetlands, or protection of wetlands, it will be advisable to stay away from them as much. How far is the setback? It's a guideline. I do have a paper with me talking about the scientific literature review of all setbacks done in, in the U.S., what it should be, and it could vary anything from 4 metre to 250 metres. It depends on scenarios from scenarios.

And in, in Canada, all we have is guidelines. 800 metre enough? I don't know, we have to decide which species inhabit the particular wetland.
Q. All right.
A. And based on that, we have to make our decision.
Q. Okay. The PDA submitted in support of the EIS aren't
complete because the timing of some surveys, such as rare plants.
A. Yes.
Q. So what I'm wondering, you can -- hoping you can tell us is what the frequency and surveys intensity of surveys should be for the identification of rare plant species within the PDA process?
A. The rare plants we are dealing here, I think a good time would be around July to do a survey, because that's the time when flower. And usually the flower help to, to identify them better. But when EnCana pretested the PDA, I think there and then, if \(I\) can remember well, they did that around October 21st, 22nd, something like that.

And they, they may have missed some of the plants because identifying plants in the field you have to be good and it could have been missed. But the best time to look for plants would be during the flowering time and I think would be around June or July.
Q. Do you think a single growing season is sufficient?
A. We should have an indication whether their plants are found. And one growing season may not be sufficient, but at least will give us an indication.

My question to you or this Panel, the NWA was
in 2003. I mean, we hear from the SEAC minutes how the Base Commander was concerned about cumulative effects, about impacts, but nothing has been done. I think we should have an idea at that time whatever critical habitat, whatever constraint, whatever, where rare plants are found. I, I don't think even to this day, as we seen yesterday, we have an idea what we are doing.
Q. Okay. In your report, you talked about some revision to the seed mixes?
A. Yes.
Q. This was in your first report. EnCana then provided some amended seed mixes in its supplemental
information. Are you familiar with those?
A. Yes.
Q. Does this information address your concerns about the seed mixes?
A. It's okay, but there are more species which could have been used.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, that will depend upon availability. And again, once we detect -- we define what we are measuring -- once we define our seed -- sorry, my seat went down telling me to shut up but ...

THE CHAIRMAN: I, I don't think that was a signal, sir.
A. But we can always re-define our seed mix at the time we do our seeding based on what's available, what's not. But \(I\) would prefer to see some, some species that establish really fast to give us the site stability, but \(I\) would also like to see some other more species like a Needle-and-Thread. Like, like making a seed mix about 40 to 60 percent Slender Wheatgrass I don't think is appropriate. But if we get some of a more climac species, it might help to reduce the timeframe for, for what the vegetation to achieve a level we want.

MS. LaCASSE:
Q. In your first report, you stated that successful reclamation was, was observed within three to seven years at Ribstone Creek natural area.
A. Yeah.
Q. But this was without influence from invasive species.
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Is Ribstone Creek a reasonable analogue for Suffield, given its geographic location?
A. You are dealing with ecological features, ecological site features, so I think it's appropriate because you're working with sand, sand dunes.
Q. Okay. What standard did you use to determine reclamation success in that case? Was it equivalent land capability or a comparison to pre-disturbance conditions?
A. Comparison to pre-disturbance condition.
Q. Okay. Based on EnCana's proposed reclamation, and, of course, your information about the NWA, what's your time estimate for ecosystem health and function to recover, after this Project?
A. It will vary from sites to sites because the landscape is quite ungulating, like it's quite dynamic and varied. And some sites will need more attention than others. And in view what we face the threat from non-native species, it could be anything from 8 to 15 years or more. It depends from site to site.
Q. Okay.
A. And some sites, if you incorporate amendments such as crimping of straw, it may enhance establishment. So it depends the level of input you want to put and what management strategy you use after that to control undesirable species.
Q. Okay. Mr. Woosaree, what frequency of monitoring do you consider is needed for judging whether a reclamation site is on the right trajectory in terms of matters such as native species and recovery time?
A. A couple of times a year.
Q. Okay. Now, I realize you may have addressed this somewhat in your reports with regard to low flat areas, but where are the highest risk, most difficult areas for reclamation in the NWA? Wetlands, alkali flats, sandy dunes?
A. We can pretty well reclaim all.
Q. All of them? Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. Would you adopt these or other range site categories as constraint areas to, to avoid locating wells and pipelines?
A. I would prefer to have a -- close to wetlands. And we hear from EnCana before but we will stay away as much as we can. And the reason for that, because in case you have an accident, spill, or pipeline break or wellhead -- spill at well -- from wellhead. And you, you may have a disaster because these wetlands serve as critical habitat and especially if you're species at risk involved and no matter how good your reclamation is, it might take longer eight years, or 20 or 30 years to claim and species won't stay. So stay away from, from these areas and areas of slopes like high slopes, like greater than 15 percent, as we had identified as risky will be more appropriate to stay away, riverbanks. So stay away as
much -- I mean, in this case, avoidance is the best measure so.
Q. Okay. Do you consider that the reintroduction of fire to the NWA would benefit plant communities or specific vegetation species at risk?
A. I thought we have too much fires in the NWA. I thought the major concern was amount of bare ground. But it depends. If we want to control invasive species, Grassland National Park is doing a burn, followed by the fallow grazing to control Crested Wheatgrass. Maybe we can learn from them. Crested Wheatgrass can be controlled with appropriate measures and spraying of round up is a good one, late in the season, towards the end of October, worked pretty good. We did that in the Ramzi Ecological Reserve. But something we have to look at.
Q. Okay. Just since you mentioned Crested Wheatgrass, can you provide any information on the persistence of it and other invasive species in NWA or in mixed-grass prairie, or do you feel you've already covered that?
A. Well, we did -- Crested Wheatgrass is only one of your nightmare. You have many more to deal with.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, if you look at all the weed species, I mean,
in the low flat one, you have lots of Smooth Brome Grass, you got Canada Thistle, Tumbleweed, Stink Weed, Dandelions, you name it, there's a lot.

So Crested Wheatgrass is only one of a major concern because it's pretty well aggressive. And you need all parties to be involved in fighting it.
Q. Okay. Well, then do you think it's feasible to try and eradicate it from the NWA or these other invasive species?
A. We are doing a project right now in Ramzi, where we are trying to eradicate it at wellsites. It is possible by, well, using mowing in the summer, you have to get it before the seeds. And in the summer, it's not practical because of the wildlife in the area. So your options will be most likely in the fall when most of the vegetation are dormant and at that -because Crested Wheatgrass green up early in the spring and stay green for a long time. So if you spray towards, like, the middle and last week of October when we are actively putting resources down the roads, that's the time to get them.

And then you repeat it again early in the spring because they green up in the spring. But you have to do it when other plants are dormant and try it this way.

But again, it will always be a battle because it was used on the prairies in the '30s to save the prairies. It is all over. I mean, we can watch for vehicles, control the vehicle entry, and things like that. But we don't control the cattle, we don't control the wildlife, we don't control the birds, so there's always a threat there which we have to stay upon.
Q. So, so would you say it's not feasible to try and eradicate it?
A. If not doing anything, which is what you're suggesting, I don't think it's wise. We should do something.
Q. Okay.
A. Because of the critical habitat, because it will keep on spreading and spreading, but it should be done as a joint effort, but we should -- when you talk about monitoring, looking for weeds, we have -- this is one point to survey, like how far it's spreading, how we can control it?

And if we talk about the new weeds, I heard there's a new one on the base. There is I think Baby's Breath occurring on the east side of the Base. So what will be (indiscernible) of this.
Q. Mr. Woosaree, I think those are all of my questions.

Thank you very much.
A. You're welcome.
Q. Now, Mr. Whidden, I suppose I've got something I'm supposed to be addressing with you?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Yes, could you repeat your question, please?
Q. I knew you were going to ask me that.
A. I think I have an answer for you.
Q. Okay. Can you provide any information that would help the Panel understand the likelihood or extent of habitat avoidance for species at risk and, in particular, \(I\) guess we were talking about --
A. The Appendix.
Q. Oh, the pellets. I'm sorry, I really did lose my place. Okay. The ungulates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. LaCasse, I believe it was to do, had to do with the update, updated information on the pellet survey for pronghorns, if I recall.

MS . LaCASSE:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Q. So, in your first report, you talk about ungulates and pellet surveys, and then EnCana conducted surveys in that regard, and analysis.

In your view, is the information contained in EnCana's EIS conclusions of insignificant impacts supported? And I think we're -- we were talking
specifically about antelopes, by the work that we've done?
A. Okay. I had a chance to cross check it again. It's a step in the right direction in terms of what they have done. It would have been, and maybe some of the intervenors and myself weren't clear enough looking at -- it would have been nicer to see information on traffic levels or loads of different roads and trails compared to pellet group distribution.

And I think they have the data, the pellet group data available. They could probably look into that, maybe not with this information they have at hand.

So, in addition to what they've done, getting an idea about what responses to traffic levels on roads and trails, and \(I\) won't get into trying to delineate the difference. We've done that enough.
Q. So you don't --
A. It would have been beneficial.
Q. Okay.
A. It would have added to this.
Q. All right. Pardon me for interrupting you. So you don't consider that what's been be done to date supports that conclusion of insignificant impacts?
A. Sorry.
Q. You don't consider that the information they've provided so far is sufficient to support their conclusion?
A. In part only.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm sorry, that's --
Q. No, no, that's fair enough. Thank you.

MS. LaCASSE: Those are my questions. Thank you, Gentlemen.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. LaCasse. Then I'll turn to my colleagues on the Panel, first of all, to see if they have any questions. Mr. DeSorcy.

QUESTIONS BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL, BY MR. DESORCY:

MR. DeSORCY:
Q. Good morning, Gentlemen. I have only one question left here, and it's for you, Dr. Whidden and it relates to one of your recommendations that you mentioned this morning. And I want to make sure I understand it, sir. Wildlife Report 2, Recommendation 7, your suggestion that SIRC work with SEAC in monitoring oil and gas activities. Do you have that, sir?
A. Yes, and.
Q. And I just want to make sure I understand that. As you're aware, SIRC has a particular role, SEAC has a
particular role, they are related but it seems to me fundamentally different. And what I'm wondering, sir, is are you suggesting that in discharging their roles, they should communicate and coordinate their work better, or are you suggesting a change in roles that would have them working together?
A. I'm not suggesting a change in roles. I'm suggesting the former in terms of more communication between the two and judging from what I've heard during the hearing process and the transcripts, it's required.

MR DeSORCY: I think you've answered my second question, too. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. DeSorcy. Dr. Ross, please.

QUESTIONS BY THE JOINT REVIEW PANEL, BY DR. ROSS:
DR. ROSS:
Q. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, Mr. DeSorcy, for asking my first question. So I will delete that one? The -- Dr. Whidden, you indicated just a few minutes ago in, in response to a question about the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan, or monitoring program that more details would be required to flesh out such a program.

I -- it's probably fair to say that these programs never jump from nothing to the perfect
monitoring program immediately. What sort -- and yet in this, for this Project, it may be necessary to get it right pretty well the first time if the issues at hand are construction, because the construction period is fairly short. What sort of a timeframe, in your opinion, would be necessary to get a good monitoring program in place?
A. Well, it ultimately depends on people's availability to sit down and cooperate and generate something like that. You'll never make everybody happy with whatever you put in there. But -- and you also have to consider and make sure that all the people involved are aware that it should be a dynamic document, whatever you produce.

Like you said, it's not going to -- you won't get it right the first time.
Q. Okay. I have an arbitrary and capricious set of orders here, so I'm going to jump back and forth.

Mr. Woosaree, I think the Government of Canada indicated that the long-term goal of reclamation ought to be restoration of native grass prairie. If that's the case, do you have any advice to offer on what would be a good early indicator of success for such a monitoring program?

Is there -- do you have to wait until the
native grass prairie has been restored before issuing a Reclamation Certificate, or are there indicators early on that the reclamation has been successful?
A. MR. WOOSAREE That's going under review right now by Alberta Environment as to what success should be. In, in the past, it used to be at the plant, the species composition and vegetation cover. At this -- after so many years when it's -- a company wants to have a site certified.

But lately, we'll revision in front of the Department of Alberta Environment, but it's too long a process to wait for 10 years or 15 years.

So what we are looking is there a shorter way to assure success and a shorter way -- I mean, I suppose, five years. So what we are doing is we're looking at trajectories of success. And that, do you -- and by that, do you have your desired plant species what you want to see?

And by that, if you are looking the dry mixed-grass prairie, you are looking at your June Grass, your Blue Grama, your Needle and Thread. So, if you seek enough -- in sufficient amount of these species based on cover, then you know you're on the right track.

And then you look at your amount of litter,
amount of litter basically will tell you about nutrient cycling. And then if -- for the community to be sustainable in the future, you have to look at the erodibility of that site. Like, is -- and if you have good vegetation cover, erosions chance will be less.

And also what are the threat from invasive species? Do you see, like, more and more weedy species start to occur, then you need an action plan to start to counter that.

So these are some of the early, call it matrix, you want to look at to be sure you're on the right path. And, of course, with continued monitoring, you, you will ensure that the site is not reversing to go opposite direction?
Q. I guess the concern, or a concern might be that if you identify after five years that, that the reclaimed area is moving on the right trajectory, and then discover at eight years that it's not, it's sort of too late because the Reclamation Certificate will have already been provided. So is it clear that for this mixed-grass prairie, there are such early indicators of success?
A. This is what, like I said, Alberta Environment is looking at. But the Reclamation Certificates, if it is issued at five years, this is the condition of this
time. Our environment is changing. With, with climate change, like the International Panel, Panel on Climate Change predicts about point -- 6.8 degrees Celsius warming up.

So, if the climate is changing, you will see more and more occurrence of species. But what happened at that time will -- would -- we need to have a plan to deal with it at that time. And if at that time we have to go out and do more spring herbicide application, so be it. Or do we accept it as part of the natural processes? We have to figure out at year 8. But at year 5, it is assessed on what it is.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Woosaree.
A. You're welcome.
Q. I'm sorry, were you finished?
A. I'm done. I mean, I can answer some questions but ...
Q. Dr. Whidden, I'm, I'm going to revisit the fragmentation effects question again. And I, I will -- I guess I'll deal first with antelope.

I think EnCana has argued that for species such as antelope, the very late use of trails will mean that there's really very little or no fragmentation effect. For that particular species, is that a credible claim or not?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Sorry, what do you mean by the late use of trails again?
Q. Of light.
A. Oh, light.
Q. Very infrequent use of these trails.
A. Intuitively I would say, yes, the less -- the lower the frequency of traffic loads on, whether it's a trail or a road, would be less disturbing to wildlife that are nearby.
Q. But that does not extend to Arthropods and Kangaroo Rats, necessarily at least?
A. Well, if -- not necessarily.
Q. Let me move on to a species you've declined to pursue before, that is Sprague's Pipits. And the reason I pick on Sprague's Pipits is that the preliminarily assessed critical habitat for Sprague's Pipit looks a lot like the National Wildlife Area.
A. Yes.
Q. And so that has some significant consequence in terms of the advice we've received from some people to consider that very seriously. And, and so I, I guess my real question is, have you any advice to offer us on, on those effects of -- for Sprague's Pipits?
A. Other than advising you to facilitate the expedition of that to be finalized. You know, when you look at that map, you've got something like 94, 95 percent
covered. How do you use, how do you use that? I -it would have a lot of implications outside of this process, in particular, too, if it was -- if that was in fact true.
Q. Let me move on, then. Different question, again directed to you. You alluded to winter effects on ungulates, elk, deer, and antelope. What's the big issue here?
A. Well, I think the, the big issue is under -- getting -- grasping an understanding of how increased traffic through drilling or winter activities which -- when most of it is supposed to happen, you've got a lot -and based upon what Jay and I saw when we were down there in February, you've got a lot of things herding up down there, whether it's elk, antelope, mule deer as well.

And when you have bunches of them together like you do, the chances of interacting with them by driving whatever truck you have around the corner, increases, \(I\) think. So in terms of -- you know, you can get into complicated analyses of energy expenditure because of snow depth, things like -along that nature so, I think, in my opinion, that's what the issue is.
```

                        It's terms of -- you've got a lot of these
    ```
critters during the winter in a condensed sort of fashion, if you will. And we may have a lot more traffic happening.

Now, granted that is during a short period of time, but the implications ...
Q. Is that covered adequately in the material presented to date?
A. As I indicated to -- sorry, I can't remember your name. To Meighan.
Q. Oh, Ms. LaCasse?
A. Yes. It would have been interesting to see some information on traffic volumes in relation to ungulate distribution.
Q. Okay. Lastly, I -- let me start with Mr. Woosaree, although you can guess from the nature of the question that \(I\) will come back and ask you the same question for a different species.

Mr. Woosaree, the critical, preliminarily assessed critical habitat has been presented to the Panel and to others for three listed plant species. Can you comment on the, on, on the critical habitat presented and/or the consequences, that is did you look at the process for determining the critical habitat for those three plant species and can you offer any advice to us that would supplement what we have already received?
A. MR. WOOSAREE: If I can remember well, some of the planted species are -- well, most rare plants are situated with disturbances and one -- for one of the plant, like there's too much blowout, like where the sand just got blown away so you don't see enough of those plants.

So that will be an issue associated with
erosion. How can we preserve that? And I think some of the plants were mapped -- were located about around the banks of Saskatchewan River and a few other locations.

So it will be not appropriate to, to know the exact locations where these plants are. And to -- we know -- we have an idea like in terms of habitat like trying to determine why they are rare.

But at some point, when we are -- for disturbance through moving soil, these are another species, so the seeds are in the soil bank, so we put, we put the soil back so you assume the seeds are in the sand bank again and they will come up.

The issue with many of the rare plants, they have low germination. Either we have to go through some natural processes for them to emerge so that you can see them in the following year. And as it
appears, sometimes you see them, sometimes you don't because you don't know what happened between now and then.

And the plant seeds got moved, like they may not show up in one year, and you found out that in the following year there's more plants than, than you at first estimated there were.

So it's important to do a repeated, repeated surveys to look at the plants again to be sure you, you can comfortable -- comfortably describe the range of location you find these plants.

And like, like I said before, if I, if I -if memory serves, serves me right, in, in the Recovery Strategy for Native Plants, even in Canada, they, they discuss about propagating plants. I'm pretty sure about that as one of the means we can look into. But to reintroduce plants in a particular species, I mean, to reintroduce plants into their natural habitat is not unusual event. It's done throughout the world. There are protocol out there. But we have to be sure before we do that what are the viable populations out there. So we'll get an idea and then what can we do to enhance this habitat, enhance the plant population.
            Does that answer your question?
Q. Close enough.
A. Okay.
Q. Dr. Whidden, we've already talked about Sprague's Pipit and the other species for which preliminarily assessed critical habitat was provided was the Ord's Kangaroo Rat. Any advice on, on that or any comment on, on that, that critical habitat?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Well, maybe not that one in particular, but going back to the both of them, I think, keeping in mind that they are preliminary assessments, Jay and \(I\) have conferred on this a bit. And it seems to be more of -- you know, it's, it's great that the work is moving forward in terms of identifying that. However it does seem to be reactive to this process.

And keeping that in mind, you know, shutting down 95 -- 94 percent of the NWA, I'm not sure if that's in anybody's mandate right now. Maybe it is, maybe it isn't.

Other options include offsets with respect to giving and taking of particular habitats, or areas of habitat, I should say. If you've got 94 percent of it is critical habitat, how much of it do you want to maintain? Ultimately.

DR. ROSS: Thank you very much gentlemen, those are my questions.
A. MR. WOOSAREE:
A. DR. WHIDDEN:

THE CHAIRMAN:

QUESTIONS BY THE CHAIRMAN:

THE CHAIRMAN:
Q. Actually, I think you've just led into a question \(I\) have as well that is just a follow-up from, from Dr. Ross's questions and your responses. And I think this is probably directed to both of you.

Environment Canada indicated that, yesterday, I believe, that a loss of preliminary critical habitat would be a lost opportunity, I think was the term nay used, if I recall. And I wonder if you share that in, in, in the context of a National Wildlife Area, if you consider that a lost opportunity. How important is that, in your view?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: I can start. To me it's important because we are, like, I mentioned a couple of times, you know, we can talk about percentages lost, whether it's a half of a percent of a percent, or 1.0 percent. But the ecological context in this particular case is quite important.

Now, preliminary assessments, we still have to get to the final nuts and bolts of things.

So to me, yeah, it's quite important. But
then again, we get back to how much, if any, do we give up?
Q. Mr. Woosaree, any comment on the same question?
A. MR. WOOSAREE: I, I agree with him, too, because critical habitat, whether it's a breeding ground or things like that it's very important. So it's good to have an idea like where we are located and how we can protect them. Until we are sure whatever disturbances we have are adequately reclaimed and we are being used by the particular species of concern.

But right now, since we don't know many of the thresholds for some of the wildlife species and so on, so we have to be very careful because once it's gone, it's gone.

So, like, again, like we talk about whether 1.0 percent is significant enough, to me, in human terms, if we have a car going away, got into an accident, out of six, one died, is it okay? To me, it's not okay because it was a loss of life. You cannot bring that back. I mean, just to try to do an analogy.

So I think we have to do our most diligence trying to protect it.
Q. Thank you. This I guess leads into another question. You mentioned thresholds and the absence of them. I guess the first question is, in, in your view, and, of course, in the absence of threshold, it makes it difficult to contemplate the the trade-offs that you suggested also, Dr. Whidden. In the absence of thresholds, is it your view that one should still proceed with a project such as this? In your view which comes first here, I guess?
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Ideally we would have had the thresholds to work with. It would make your job a lot easier.
Q. I suppose it would.
Q. But just on that, again do you have other examples of similar areas where such thresholds exist?
A. Do I have examples where similar thresholds?
Q. Yes.
A. Understanding and generating thresholds for wildlife populations is a can of worms that's been open for a very long time in many areas of this Province.
Q. That's why I asked the question.
A. And other places. It's difficult.
Q. That's why I -- yes, that's why I asked question. It's difficult to develop those thresholds, I presume.
A. Yes, and as I indicated before, you won't make
everybody happy regardless of the threshold selected or used. But they should be -- you know, if and when they come up, they have to be considered as dynamic to a certain degree, but at least you'll have a target or something to compare what's out there against.
Q. Now, \(I\) know again from testimony from the Department of National Defence that they are planning to develop those, or at least thresholds of some sort, they are clearly not in place at this point. Who should be involved, in your view, in developing such thresholds?
A. Who should be involved?
Q. Yes.
A. Any -- well, given the nature of this particular site, you know, interveners at hand, other stakeholders. I know we've had some Aboriginal First Nation involvement, but not today, or not lately.

It, it's fairly complicated. You've got a lot of biologists in that area that are here and that are not here, or haven't been here or chosen not to be here, that could give you a lot of information on that.

Now, I think the idea of using the thresholds for wildlife has to be part of the greater formalized plan for managing the NWA, which we're still looking
for.
A. MR. WOOSAREE:

To, to -- like, I know
thresholds, it's, it's difficult to do, I mean, I never have to do it. But \(I\) think to look at viable population, what is the minimal number of, of units of a particular species, but you need to breed to produce successfully to the next generation to ensure survival.

So if we know that it might help us a little bit. Do you need, for example, like one male, two females or vice versa, what is the viable population? And if you don't have continuity of population survival, then it won't be sustainable. So maybe that's another way to look at it.
A. DR. WHIDDEN: Just to add to that, there's also the considerations of the amount of habitat available in terms of there's been some theory bantered around, once a certain percentage is lost, depending upon the species, then it basically goes to hell in a hand basket after that. So there's sort of a, the cut off in terms of habitat loss as well. Not just animal numbers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you gentlemen, that concludes my questions as well. And it concludes all of the questions for you today. I would like to thank
you for both your work in examining and preparing your reports and also assisting us here in these proceedings as well. Thank you very much.

\section*{(JOINT REVIEW PANEL EXPERT WITNESSES EXCUSED)}

THE CHAIRMAN:
Looking at the clock, it's now about lunchtime. The one matter that we still have to deal with is the rebuttal panel with EnCana. And I might ask Mr. Denstedt if you could give us a sense of your plans just to assist in, in our plans in terms of setting the schedule for today.

MR. DENSTEDT: You bet, sir. The plan is to sit the five witnesses I indicated yesterday. We will be under an hour in the presentation. There's only one table and a handful of pictures that we're going to be submitting so there's -- and I've circulated that to the other lawyers and I'll provide that to the Panel here right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.
MR. DENSTEDT: So we're in your hands.
THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. Well, thank you, Mr. Denstedt. I think -- let me ask one more question. I know that food service is perhaps not as accessible today as it is during the week, but would one-hour be sufficient for lunch? I see nodding, so let's take a break and we'll return at 1 o'clock,
then, to hear the EnCana Panel. Thank you.
(NOON BREAK)
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 12:06 P.M.)
(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 1:02 P.M.)

THE CHAIRMAN:
Ladies and Gentlemen, welcome back after lunch.

Mr. Lambrecht, I see you wish to speak. Go ahead, please.

UNDERTAKING MATTER SPOKEN TO

MR. LAMBRECHT:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And with the consent of my friends, an undertaking was requested during cross-examination by Ms. Klimek. It appears at page 3548 of the transcript. And it relates to a photograph which is in the Crown's Opening Statement, Exhibit 003-031, at page 35. And the question was:
"Q. And my next question was and maybe that will answer it, is when did it occur and is there some -and where? Is it close to -- if you could give us that information." And the answer was: "A. Yeah, we'll take that on, thanks."

MR. DENSTEDT: that.

THE CHAIRMAN
Yeah. I was going to say, you took it up with clarity.

MR. LAMBRECHT: It's, it's a picture, it's the -- it's -- on page 35 of the Opening Statement, there are four pictures. This relates to an area that is in the lower left-hand corner of those four. And my understanding is that this was reported on August 10th of 2008 and it is believed that the incident occurred sometime between July \(26 t h\) and \(28 t h\), 2008. And that I think completes the understandings that are requested.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lambrecht.

MR. LAMBRECHT: Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now turn to EnCana's panel. And welcome, gentlemen. I would remind you that you are still under oath. And I am pleased to see that you are all sitting in the same order, so that will assist our court reporter. Welcome back.

ENCANA REBUTTAL WITNESS PANEL, (Recalled)

Joel Heese (on Former Affirmation)

Francis L'Henaff (on Former Oath)
Stephen Fudge (on Former Oath)

Douglas Collister (on Former Oath)

Dr. David Walker (on Former Oath)
MR. DENSTEDT: Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to walk the panel through any specific questions. I'm just going to let them -- turn them loose and let them have their say. They have been instructed to keep it under one hour so, after one hour, feel free to cut them off.

THE CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that authority you've given me, Mr. Denstedt.

I'll turn to the panel to proceed.

\section*{EVIDENCE BY DR. WALKER}
A. DR. WALKER: Do we have visuals? David Walker. I believe we've looked at this picture a number of times over the last several days. I would like to clarify a few things.

I haven't looked at this particular site on the ground or from the air, but I've certainly looked at a lot of sites that resemble that. And I can tell you, from my experience, that what we're probably looking at here is what it looked like soon after it was reclaimed and it has remained looking like that pretty much for the duration.

One of the things we've learned over the last 30 years in revegetation is that, when it comes to succession on reclaimed sites, it follows what they
```

call an initial floristics model, and in layman's
terms, that's: "What you seed is what you get".
"What you seed is what you get." And that means when
you do it for the first time, you better get it right,
because sometimes there's not a lot of opportunity to
change things.

```
    So the next picture, I would like to take a
shot at the assumptions being made on some of the
Crested Wheatgrass spread testimony that's been given.
This is a document, 003, I believe, dash 031, Tab B.
Brent Smith. This is an "Assessment of Agronomic
Species Invasion. And if we could look at the top of
that picture, \(I\) would like to read you out the
assumptions that were made in doing this study (as
read) :
            "Would the area seeded along a
                pipeline was consistent at
                    2.44 metres -- any agronomic plants
                    detected further from 1.5 metres
                    perpendicular to the centre of the
                    pipeline were considered to have
                    invaded native prairie."
            So if we could go back and look at the bottom
part of the picture. The pipeline in this photo is
just to the right of the truck. And I'm going to show
you what 2.44 metres looks like. [Stretching out tape measure]. There it is right there. It's not possible to put a pipeline in, either trenching or ripping, in that kind of a distance without disturbing outside that area. It would be far more typical to go way outside that area. In fact, in that era, there were no guidelines for the edge of a pipeline right-of-way. They could go wherever they wanted. And generally they did. It wasn't until about 1990 when I worked on the TransCanada pipeline in the Great Sand Hills that we actually assigned a boundary for construction and edge of right-of-way. And so they would have spread out all over the place.

And so what we're looking at really is, is old plants that have persisted over the duration of time and probably we're looking at native encroachment in to the sides. I mean, this is purported to be Crested Wheatgrass being -- invading outwards from picture right to picture left. It's probably just as likely that this is native species encroaching into the Crested Wheatgrass from the right, so it is an overstatement to say that that is evidence of Crested Wheatgrass invasion.

Now, I believe probably that, that
Dr. Henderson and I, and Brent Smith, are probably no
more than a few beers away from being in complete agreement on, on the issue of Crested Wheatgrass and its invasability (sic). I certainly agree that it, it does invade. The evidence that was presented is that it invades at an average of 0.1 metres, 10 centimetres, that's 4 inches, (indicating), on coarse-textured soil, more on finer textured soil. It does invade, but \(I\) would ask the Panel to keep in mind the evidence as to what the rate of expansion is. And that's certainly not to say we don't want to try to do our best to control it.

Another one of the conclusions from this study was that:
"Native vegetation is
re-established to a higher degree than expected...

It says in the "Conclusions":
"... which were deliberately seeded
to agronomic species. The native
value was 27."

So here we have old pipeline right-of-ways, seeded to agronomics, and the natives now outnumber the cover of the non-native species. Nevertheless, it, it is something that we would like to control.

I would suggest that if we were successful in
replacing the Crested Wheatgrass here, it would probably look much the same. It wouldn't be green from Crested Wheatgrass, it would be blue from probably Western Wheatgrass because it will take a highly aggressive and persistent species to replace Crested Wheatgrass and outlast it. So it will pretty much look the same, I guess.

And I would also suggest, if Crested Wheatgrass were ever to be used as a green strip to control fire, that that's what it would look like. That would be what a green strip would look like. And that has been used in other places to check wildfires across the prairie.

There was another note about pipelines that were seeded more recently and had non-native species in them, agronomics. And I can certainly appreciate the concern over that. It's not necessarily a matter of negligence on the part necessarily. Well, I'll, I'll reserve that.

I found it interesting the comments about Alberta Energy not following the instructions of SEAC in seeding native species in the '80s. I can tell you from that era, it was very difficult getting seed lots that were clean, that it had to be imported from the States, and very often they were contain -- they
contained species that we certainly don't want up here. Downy Brome, Knapweed, and other noxious species. And I say good for those guys for not using that seed, otherwise we would have a real problem there. Right now we just have Crested Wheatgrass. But, in general, they did not seed if it was dirty seed. And good for those guys.

And we still seem to have a problem getting seed lots that don't have undesirable species in them. I know this in my own experience in purchasing seed. And for Express, we had the client, Alberta Energy, purchase the seed directly and do it. I don't know where the problem is coming from, whether it's the seed supplier, dirty seed drills, or whatever, but it seems that it's difficult to seed and not have some Crested Wheatgrass come out. But we have plans for that.

If we could have the next slide, please, Ryan. One after that. In the EEMP, the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan, there are instructions for acquiring plant materials. And the first on the list is to maintain the chain of custody so that you protect the -- and avoid substitution, use only seed products that can be identified as to source, and ensure all the equipment is pre -- free of previously used materials.

The next one, please.
The next page.
We do have a step-wise set of criteria that will carry us through the life of the Project; benchmarks, if you will, to get us on the right trajectory towards the desired criteria for success. The first one is plant establishment. This is a year after. We're looking for a specific seedling density to make sure we have the plants there. The next stage is plant cover. After two to four growing seasons, we are looking for enough cover for erosion control. And we are asking for both stability and ground cover standards after three to seven years. And I have that range there because drought is a part of the natural cycle and it may take that long to get there.

The next one, please. Well, we've gone past one of them. One back, please. Site stability. There was a lot of talk about soil loss tolerance, and I won't subject you to my demonstration again, but there is a number that we are using that is well defended. There's a citation in the submission, Wall et al., which is document produced by Ag Canada and all of the agriculture departments throughout Canada, all contributed to this document on soil loss
and they set a soil loss standard. And it is 4 tonnes per hectare per year. And that is what we're recommending. And that is what the City of Calgary has adopted, and others. And it has been reviewed and approved by Dr. George Foster who is one of the developers of the Universal Soil Loss Equation. There was some discussion as to how it would be implemented or enforced. I'll point you to the text where it says that the \(T\)-value is used for modelling and designing erosion control plans. And so the management and the enforcement in compliance would be based on the development of a plan prepared by a qualified individual and its proper implementation. So that's where the pinch comes. And that standard applies throughout the life of the Project, including the operations phase.

The next page, please, Ryan.
There's an indicator, at the top there, of \(a\), of a chart, of what you might use for a field assessment of, of erosion control or site stability. It's relating cover to soil loss. It is not the only parameter for controlling erosion, so it would depend on soil roughness, for example.

The next at the bottom there is community plant structure. And there was discussion about what
would constitute a reclaimed site. I have downplayed, I guess, the composition because that depends on land use. This approach, it depends very much on what the stakeholders decide is the ultimate land use, whether it's grazing, habitat, and so there's flexibility in the composition, but in terms of the structure, I'm, I'm, quite hard about having layers, ground layers, tall, and mid-sized plants, and so this is the way the horizontal plant cover, a way of assessing that and measuring whether we've got there or not.

The next one please, Ryan.
Here's an example of two sites that have been reclaimed around a wellsite. The one on the left, Crested Wheatgrass, doesn't have structure. It's all the height of the Crested Wheatgrass. All one layer. The site beside in 1985, which I'm calling restored prairie, are all native species on-site. And there are tall and short and ground level plants there, so that has structure, it has layers, and that would meet the criteria.

The next one, please. The next page.

There was discussion as to whether soil
compaction was dealt with. And it is referenced in a number of places in the Reclamation Plan, in the Environmental Protection Plan, and then again in the

EPP. There are standards for rutting deeper than 100 millimetres on tracks, wheel tracks, and there's also a chart here that relates bulk density with route restriction density that varies with the soil texture. So that's covered as well.

Okay, well, the next one, please.
Here are some examples of applying the rangeland reclamation success protocol to a number of wellsites. This first example, drilled in 1985, was a natural recovery site. It's well sited, as you can see, protected by hills on the other side. Picture upper right. We couldn't find it looking for the access trail. We had to put our -- put it into our GPS. Once we got there, we could find a vague trail. The operator had been in there for the annual inspection and we were able to follow it out, but we couldn't find it going in.

The middle row, the left, native vegetation is completely grown around. There are no non-native species there. This was our best site. I was reluctant to give it 100 percent mark. We found a little wheel rut which allowed me to dock a few points there. But it had a very diverse and interesting establishment of native species around it. And there were no non-native species on this site anywhere to be
seen, anywhere close.
So if it were a case of looking for targets or reference sites, things like this could be used. It could be characterized and compared and then this could be one of the targets. It doesn't necessarily have to be a historic plant community, or one. It could be a successful and reclaimed one.

Let's have a look at a couple of sites that weren't quite so good. The next one, this is 2001 and this is from the Infill Drilling Program. Again, natural recovery, native species around the wellhead, Pasture Sage had re-established along the pipeline right-of-way. This is a native forb, which is an early colonizer, lots of native species around there. Let's look at the last row.

I docked this site because of the amount of runoff that was still on the area. It was a slope. And it -- and there was a long flow path there, so the site stability attribute was not as good as it could have been. And that probably would have required some surface modification, some roughness. We heard a bit about that this morning about leaving it rough. That would have possibly created a bit more disturbance, but this was on the right-of-way, it was ploughed in, and it could have been left rougher than it was.

The next one.

This is one that is an example of a wellsite that's giving everybody a lot of grief, a wellsite that is put into a Crested Wheatgrass field, and the seed bank is full of seed, and, of course, it has come back. This is, again, drilled recently in the Infill 2003 and there is a lot of Crested Wheatgrass around the wellhead. And, and I think that the program they are looking at, perhaps of looking at ways of replacing that, the Crested Wheatgrass, with more seed of other species might be a good approach, but I would encourage EnCana to put their wellsites in sites like this rather than on to native prairie, just to reduce the amount of disturbance and then perhaps tackle the problem of that.

You can't really deduct points from a site that's been seeded years ago or a pasture like this just because of Crested Wheatgrass. But I certainly deduct points because of hydrologic function because of the runoff because of the amount of bare ground that you would get from Crested Wheatgrass.

So to bring this up to a reclamation standard from my point of view would require a bit of work, some roughness, to improve that.

And that's me. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN:
A. DR. WALKER: down.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we need to put that tape measure on as an exhibit, Dr. Walker. You weren't suggesting that, were you.

EVIDENCE BY MR. COLLISTER
A. MR. COLLISTER: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to speak a little bit to snakes and then to critical or preliminarily assessed critical habitat, a little bit to PDA, and then a little bit to fragmentation. And I think I can stay within 10 minutes or so.

On pages 2962 to 2966 of the hearing transcript for October 22 nd, Mr. Didiuk introduced some new evidence on snake mortality. The material, which is Exhibit 003-050, is a PowerPoint presentation to CWS, DND, and SIRC. I don't think we need to call it up, unless later if somebody wants to talk about it. But I have some comments on it.

Mr. Didiuk indicated that this material provided incite on the efficacy on a 50 kilometre per hour speed limit in reducing snake mortality. However, the objectives of the work listed on the second slide of that presentation do not include an
evaluation of the relationship of vehicle speed to snake mortality.

In addition, the second-last slide, which appears to be Mr. Didiuk's summary and conclusions, includes the statement, and I quote:
"Low sample sizes of snake
observations and highly variable traffic patterns did not allow assessment of snake mortality in relation to traffic. Nevertheless
there were good things that resulted from this work in this presentation. I'm informed by

EnCana that the snake mitigation area was created as a result of
this. South Buffalo Gate was
closed."

That's the gate in the southeast corner of the NWA .
```

"Both South Buffalo Road and Sapper
Trail were closed to thru-traffic
during snake migration. And
Bingville Road was established as
the main south access and
north/south route into CFB

```

Suffield. And these considerations are still in effect and are included in EnCana's mitigation to minimize snake mortality from this Project."

With respect to the question of vehicle speed and snake mortality, it turns out that the paper entitled "Demographic Effects of Road Mortality in Black Rat Snakes" which was referenced by Mr. Didiuk yesterday when he was talking about population viability, does provide some help. The authors state the following on page 122 near the end of the second-last paragraph:
"Vehicles on Pinnacon Road..."

And this study was situated in southern Ontario in cottage country:
"... travel at relatively slow
speeds, approximately 60 kilometres
per hour. Therefore, in most
cases, drivers probably see snakes
well in advance and the driver's
behaviour could drastically
influence the number of snakes
killed."

So those authors clearly thought that 60
kilometres an hour was -- would be helpful in terms of
mitigating snake mortality.
I would like to continue on snakes for just a bit longer and comment and respond to Mr. Didiuk's evidence yesterday morning. I believe he characterized his evidence on snake population viability as a demonstration exercise. And I believe that this is a fair characterization considering the many assumptions he had to make. Mr. Didiuk used a number of 575 adult female rattlesnakes, which I believe is low. I don't know what the right number is, but as I testified earlier in the proceedings, there were undoubtedly thousands of rattlesnakes in the NWA, perhaps more than \(10,000\).

Mr. Didiuk's mortality assumptions are based on activity quite different than the proposed Project. In 2006, construction, as we've gone over a number of times before, occurred during the spring/early summer snake migration period, which is not a very good time if you want to avoid snake mortality.

On page 47 of Exhibit 003-051, and we might want to turn that up, Ryan, if we have that. Let's see if... Is that page 47. Yeah, on the first paragraph is what I'm, is what I'm -- or the, pardon me, the second-last paragraph -- no, the first paragraph under "Mitigation and Mortality of Snakes
from Traffic."

I just want to make the point that, in this document, which is authored by Mr. Didiuk, he commends EnCana for its snake mitigation in the last line of that first paragraph, which is, which is good.

And if we, if we turn the page, can we go down to the next page, at the bottom of 48 , 1 believe. And from here, from page 48 through to page 50, there are a number of mitigation recommendations that Mr. Didiuk makes. And they are good recommends. And EnCana has embraced those recommendations. And they are included in the mitigations for this Project. And, in fact, they form much of the basis for the mitigation for the Project.

EnCana recognized very early that snake mortality was an important issue, very early outside of this Project process, and also very early in the planning for the EIS and this Project. And, in fact, EnCana had already recognized and acted on that understanding. And we saw that by Mr. Didiuk's comments on page 47:
```

"A large percentage of the
mitigations in the wildlife section
of the EIS, Volume 3, Section 5.8.2
relate to reducing snake mortality,

```
                        including confining construction to
            winter."

In fact it was probably the -- of all of the, of all of the VECs, it, it -- snakes were the VECs that were -- probably got undue attention in terms of mitigation considerations.

With the mitigation proposed by EnCana, mortality due to the Project will be lower than the already low mortality experienced in 2006, notwithstanding that was a pretty bad time to, to be out there, when construction occurred during spring and early summer. And it's highly unlikely, in my opinion, to affect population viability or cause a decline.

So I'd like to move on to Sprague's Pipit and Preliminarily Assessed Critical Habitat. On page 3104, October 22nd, and pages 3226 to 3227, October 23, Ms. Dale fostered the impression, I believe, that Sprague's Pipit is limited in its occurrence on the MTA. If I may, I would like to provide some information in this regard that will help the Panel in evaluating the appropriateness of terminating preliminarily assessed critical habitat for this species at the boundary of the NWA. I offer this information, however, with the caveat that I do
not agree with Environment Canada's preliminarily assessed critical habitat for Sprague's Pipit.

Could we turn up -- so we're going to turn up Volume 3 of the EIS, Appendix 5 J , which is Exhibit 002-014. And this is Figure J3. And what I wanted to show on this Figure, can \(I\) use your pointer, Steve, this figure illustrates survey points for birds, point count survey sites, that were surveyed in 1996 and 2004.

Now, the red points, which you can see are pretty widespread across the MTA, were surveyed, were established in 1996 and then replicated in 2004 as part of the Formation Level Impact Assessment for DND.

The yellow dots, which are not so easy to see, they are sort of scattered around. That was the Disturbance Assessment. Those were surveyed only in 2004. It's not important that we can't see those because I would just like to focus on the red dots which were surveyed in 1996, as I mentioned, one year after the CWS inventory of 1994 to '95.

And maybe we can turn back, Ryan, to Table 5J1, which has already been up once, I think. So I just bring this up to -- so, so this Table represents a subset of the 700 and -- oh, I don't have the number here. Anyway, it's a subset of the CWS
point count survey sites that were surveyed in 1994 to 1995. And the subset, as you can see, is 317.

And if we look down at Sprague's Pipit, we can see that in 1994/'95, there were 99 Sprague's Pipits detected on those, on those 317 sites. The number of Sprague's Pipits that were detected during survey of the 223 Dillon sites, so that's those red sites that \(I\) pointed out on Figure 5J3, in 1996 was 210. And this information is available in Exhibit 003A-002, Table 7, Annex V.

So just to recap that, there were 99 Sprague's Pipits that were detected at 317 sites in the NWA in 1994 to 1995; while there were 210 Sprague's Pipits from 223 sites in the MTA in 1996.

Now, the data is one year apart, but notwithstanding that, it's clear that Sprague's Pipit is not discriminating between the NWA and the MTA. And I guess this implies that most of CFB Suffield is preliminarily assessed critical habitat for this species.

I'd like to move on now and just speak briefly to EnCana's PDA process on a couple of what appear to be misunderstandings with regard to it. And if we can pull up, Ryan, Appendix E of EnCana's reply, Exhibit 002-110, page E5. And if we can, yes, go down
to E-251 and 253.

Okay, the first thing I just want to make clear because I detected there was some misunderstanding about it, it is clear that the Burrowing Owl survey is proposed as a comprehensive NWA-wide survey. And that's in E-2.5.1. So it's not associated with pipelines, it's not associated with wellsites; it's a comprehensive survey across the entire NWA.

As well as supporting infrastructure location, it will provide a good estimate of the NWA population of Burrowing Owls and will be useful to many interested parties, including DND and Environment Canada. And this is true for many of the PDA surveys, particularly the ones that will be NWA wide.

If we move down to 2.5.3, I'd also like to correct another misunderstanding, I believe. And as you can see in 2.5.3, contrary to the assertion by Dr. Roland, the Burrowing Owl survey is consistent with the ASRD Protocol, which is referenced in that section, in the third line.

The surveys carried out in 2008 and documented in Appendix J of EnCana's Reply, which is Exhibit 002-117, and I don't think we need to turn that up, allowed EnCana to refine its estimate of the
time required and that was because EnCana also was concerned about the do-ability of these surveys. When we proposed these surveys to them in this approach for a PDA assessment, they had, they had some of the similar concerns to what we've heard during the proceedings.

But having done -- having gone out and done the trial for many of the surveys, we're confident in our estimate of the time required. And I'd like to add that constraints due to weather and templating can be overcome using larger crews for less days.

In addition, and this is something that really hasn't come up yet, Military templating can be flexible if there is a will. And \(I\) have an example of that, because I, as I mentioned, I surveyed all of those sites in both '96 and 2004 on the MTA. And in 2004 I ran into a problem because there was a major training exercise going on during the month of June in the area that \(I\) had to get into in order to get the data to help with the assessment for formation-level training.

So the Military found itself in, you know, a bit of an awkward spot; they wanted the assessment done, but, of course, it was difficult for them to, you know, to see a way to let me in there.

To make a long story short, they did. They did find a way. The Military made it work. And I was able to survey right in the middle of that training exercise. So there are ways to do these things as long as there's an interest in getting them done. The last thing I'd like to touch on is what has been a subject for a fair bit of today, and that's fragmentation and effective habitat loss, and it's been a focus of much of this hearing. And I'd like to respond a bit to the evidence by Environment Canada yesterday.

We, too, conducted a comprehensive survey of the literature on this subject and, additionally, we reviewed the references provided by Environment Canada, although most of them we were already familiar with. Very few were relevant as can be seen by Environment Canada's reliance on the Linnen 2006 Paper from the Grey Literature, even though it did not demonstrate significant effects.

Most of the references that were provided by Environment Canada dealt with study areas quite different than EnCana's shallow gas infill proposal, and papers reported on a myriad of things, in some cases, hundreds or thousands of vehicles per day compared to what we're looking at in the Project,
high-grade roads, not trails, major pipelines, non-native habitat, recreational activities, species that don't occur in the NWA, et cetera.

However, one study that is relevant and hasn't been discussed as much as I would have thought in these proceedings is the Great Sand Hills Study. And that is Exhibit 003A-009. I don't think we need to turn it up.

In that study, the effect of shallow gas wells and trails and roads -- I'll back up a second. In that study, the effect of shallow gas wells, and then trails and roads, so two separate entities, was investigated with respect to grassland birds. On page 96, the Study states:
"There were 14 birds that were
looked at. Seven of 14 bird
species responded positively to the
presence of natural gas wells.
Only Clay Coloured Sparrow,
however, responded negatively, with
the remaining species having mostly
marginal increases in occurrence
within one kilometre of a well.
That category remaining species
includes Sprague's Pipit."

So there was no effect. A little later on, on the same page, the authors even suggest that the negative effect on Clay-coloured Sparrow was spurious. And they give reasons for that.

On page 81, the study states, and this is in relation to road and trail impacts, that:
"Road and trail impacts were
significant for five species.

Baird's Sparrow, Chestnut-collared
Longspur and Savannah Sparrow were
negatively associated..."
So there was a negative effect..
"... while Clay Coloured Sparrow
and Common Nighthawk were
positively associated."

However, it needs to be noted that roads and trails in the Great Sand Hills study included five categories that increased in intensity from grass, which they defined as "vegetated road", and I would submit would be similar to the access trails that are envisaged for this Project, to grid roads, all of which were grouped for analysis. So that was too bad. But they grouped everything for analysis.

So the access trails proposed by EnCana would correlate with the lowest intensive -- intensity
category. And it's interesting to point out that, even with these higher intensity roads included in the analysis, Sprague's Pipit did not exhibit a response to this road and trail grouping.

In summary, \(I\) have to say it's disappointing that Environment Canada takes the position that the low impact shallow gas infill development proposed by EnCana will result in fragmentation and effective habitat loss for grassland birds when the body of literature suggests otherwise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Collister.
Mr. Fudge.

EVIDENCE BY MR. FUDGE
A. MR. FUDGE: Yes. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

Ryan, could we turn up -- from the
Environmental Assessment, I'd like to take you to the infamous page, 226, in the Volume 4 of the Environmental Assessment, which Mr. Chairman is the, part of the groundwater assessment. And at the top of the page, the third paragraph down, under "Mitigation" is an error. And, unfortunately, this led the NRCan folks, Dr. Nastev, down the wrong road. And we apologize for that. But if you look in that second sentence under the word, under the heading
"mitigation", you see the number 129,187.5, which is referred to as "groundwater". And that's incorrect. It's not groundwater. The number is correct, but it refers to the -- it should -- it does refer to the total amount of water which was predicted at that time two years ago when the study was done. It's just a typo.

So let's, let's flip the page over. By the way, do you need an example number? I'm sorry, I should have said that. Are we okay? It's Exhibit 002-015.

So we're flipping the page back to page 226. And if you look at the total on the right-hand side of Table 2-9, you see where the 129 came from, which is the total amount of water used. It's not, it's not, it's not indicating how much groundwater is used, it's just the total amount of water used. So that's, that's the error. And it's unfortunate that that error was on the other page with using that, because it obviously led Dr. Nastev down the wrong road.

We did try to correct that, Mr. Chairman. I tried to correct it. Mr. Denstedt tried to correct it for the record. That it's -- 35,000 cubic metres of water per annum is the predicted use of water, of groundwater for the NWA for the wells to be drilled in
the NWA for this proposed Project.
So I just wanted to make sure that was correct.

So let's -- could we go back to page 226, Ryan, please. If you look under "Residual Effects Rating", you will see the groundwater amount referred to several times in that section, the 35,125 cubic metres per annum. So I just wanted to make sure that we're all right about what EnCana's prediction is on groundwater use.

So let's now -- you know, the other thing is, I just wanted to make a point that the use of water, and in the case of the \(129,000,35,000\) is predicted to come from groundwater supply, the remainder of the water would come from multiple sources, including the South Saskatchewan River, which we spoke of before, and also from the City of Medicine Hat where the vehi -- where tanker trucks, when they are on their way into the Suffield area, would fill up with water and arrive at the block with a full tank. So there's, so there's a multiple of potential sources.

Now I'd like to go to, turn to the LandWise 2008 Groundwater Report, Table 22 on page 61, Exhibit 003A-031, Tab (g). And this was, this was referenced by Dr. Nastev as well. And I just wanted
to go over this Table, because it's an interesting report and it's an interesting Table. So, you know, looking at this Table, Mr. Chairman, you can see that the -- McNeil and McNeil have, have here that the available groundwater is 421,500 cubic metres per year and the total estimated water requirements at the right, at the far right-hand side exceed that. And that was pointed out yesterday.

But let's look at this Figure, the third figure, the 131,380, because this was very interesting to me to try to determine where these numbers came from.

I want to point out that the available groundwater in the main pre-glacial tributary channel, the Lethbridge aquifer, as it's been called, that is, that is, and is stated in the report to be their estimate. It's not a measured quantified number; it's an estimate. And there have been -- this report is preceded by several, which are referred to as well. Their estimates have gone as high as 1.2 million cubic metres per annum. So, you know, they are being very conservative here. And I think that's a reasonable thing to do given that this is an extremely dry area and you have to be careful with groundwater use. And, particularly, with a view to protecting associated
wetlands. So that's -- they have chosen -- and I believe, if you read -- my reading of it is it's a conservative value of 421,000 , but \(I\) want to focus on the 131,000 , which is -- as you note, is the average existing groundwater use at six wells. So let's go and find out where that came from. And let's investigate, just briefly, is that a good number and does that, does that reflect recent use and does it reflect predictions of use in the future.

So if we could turn now, Ryan, please, to Table, or to page 31, Table 6 in the same report. And that's, again, Exhibit 003A-3. That doesn't sound right. 031, I guess, Tab (g), because it's the same reference, exhibit reference.

Okay. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the very bottom, you'll see the 131,378 , right, which is the average. If you look at the totals along the right-hand side, you see the totals there? If you look at those totals, those are the totals for the years 2002 through to 2006, inclusive, for the six, six wells that are noted above. So if you take those total numbers on the right-hand side and average them, you come up with an average of 131,378 cubic metres. Now, if you -- what is really interesting if you look at those totals on the right-hand side is you
note that they are decreasing over time. From 2002 to 2006, we've gone from two thousand -- in the 200,000 s to 43,000. So there's been a big decrease, as measured, in this LandWise Report from these wells used mainly by EnCana of groundwater use.

And so "Why is that?" is, was my question to myself. Well, less wells are being drilled now than they were then. And there's been reuse and recycling of water.

But -- so for the purposes -- and as I suggested, the -- as I stated, the prediction is 35,000 cubic metres of groundwater for the NWA portion.

Now, this, by the way, this water would be used -- it wasn't used in the NWA, it was used over the whole block, correct, so I just want to make sure that we're aware of that.

So what I looked at is, and talking with the EnCana operational people, they felt that the last two years here, 2005/2006 averaged would be a better go forward number looking at predicted water use in the future. And if you average 66,000 the total for 2005, and 45,900 for 2006, you come up with a number of 55,000 cubic metres as an average for those two years. And the operational people at EnCana say that's
probably a better number to go, to use, than the 131,000, which is the average, which is weighted towards the years 2002/2003, so.

Are you with me on that, Mister -- good, okay.

So let's go back to table 22, again, on page 61 where we started this process. Now, if you are looking -- these are all estimates. This is the average use, the 131,000. Now, if you substitute 55,000, which the operational people feel is more, a more useful number to look at in terms of predicted water use, if you substitute the 55,000 for the 131,000 number, we have now a water surplus; we do not exceed the available groundwater in our total estimated water requirements.

So it just depends on your look and where you look at the numbers, sir. I just wanted to point that out because I thought it would be an interesting exercise, because -- in terms of water use on a go-forward basis, what's predicted.

Okay. Yes, so anyway, we have a -- now we have a 40-thousand-dollar -- a 40,000 cubic metre surplus, quote unquote. But these are all very big estimates with very low levels of confidence, I would say, in this groundwater world. So there we are.

Now, I'd also like to speak to groundwater overallocation. And this seemed to be an issue for, for the NRCan people when they reviewed the report. And in fact they, in their presentation, used a summary table -- a table summarized from data that we had in the Environmental Assessment in Volume 4.

So I've taken the licence to create a table using the data which we just looked at and using the licences which EnCana has for these wells. I have -we have those on file, by the way, those licences. But here's the difference.

Now, by the way, Mr. Chairman, the 45,000 differs from the 55,000 average because there's no licence for the Bayonette well. It's not proposed to be used in the future. And that's EnCana's position. And there's no licence for it. So what we've taken out of that table that we've just looked at, we've taken Bayonette well out. Now we have -- and this is the average of the last two years in the LandWise Report of 45,000, but they are holding, EnCana is holding allocations of 128,000 based on their 2008 licences for those wells.

So we just have to -- all I'm -- my point is allocation is not use; allocation is allocation. And, typically, wells are allocated at a higher level than
what they are used. I just -- that's just a point. So it's not always bad news if you have a high allocation in terms of these wells.

So a few more issues. I'd like to go -- I'd like to just look at groundwater use. Groundwater use in this area and what is -- what's currently -- what has happened in the past. And in our EIS evidence in Appendix 2-6, and also in LandWise, this same document that we've just looked at, they show monitoring results for a number of wells that are close to the, close to or just in the NWA.

And I'd like to point out, Mr. Chairman, and I can -- there, if you can just -- those two wells up there. "Big Bob" and, can you just control up a little bit, and Dugway. In particular, because these two wells are -- they are the two closest wells to the NWA. They are in the Lethbridge aquifer. And they have -- they show over a period of three to five years good recovery after use and there's no evidence of declining watertable there. And that's pointed out in the LandWise Report as well.

I'd now like to go to, in the LandWise Report, the page 65, if you would, please. At the top of the page. And they are looking -- they were looking at the monitoring results here from Dugway
well, up here, Dugway well, and the PFR Windmill well, which is in the, in the proximity of the Dugway well.

And in the -- and looking at these -- anyway, the basic line here is that it suggests water levels may not have changed significantly with time in surficial sands in the easy coulee system. That's one point there. And also in paragraph three, one, two, three:
```

                "Water source wells installed in
                the main pre-glacial channel south
                of Dishpan Lake, Dugway and "Big
                Bob"...."
    ```

Which, by the way, don't have temporary licences, they have part -- whatever the, whatever the right term is here in Alberta, they have full licences for water:
"... are the most suitable for groundwater withdrawal."

And I've spoken to the authors of this report, and confirmed that with them. They feel that these are very good wells, they produce very well, so to speak, and they don't believe there'll be, there has been a problem with them or there would be a problem in the future at the 35,000 usage that has been discussed.

Once again, I'd like to -- and one more thing, and I'm finished, and that is page -- sorry, in terms of monitoring, Mr. Chairman. EnCana has proposed in the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan, as we have discussed previously, candidate monitoring studies for groundwater quality and quantity and also for adjacent wetlands looking at the effect of withdrawals of groundwater on adjacent wetlands. And so they certainly have -- they have volunteered those as candidate studies.

But, in addition, and speaking to the EnCana people and their operational people, they agree in principle with the overall recommendations regarding monitoring groundwater as described on pages 111 to 113 in the LandWise 2008 Report, which includes groundwater quality and quantity, and also, and -well, there they are, look:
- Monitoring groundwater within five well locations.
- Monitoring well levels at
five well locations.

If you could scroll down, please.
- Conduct aquifer tests on each well.

Next one, please.
- Install and monitor observation wells.

Next one, please.
- Control groundwater withdrawal rates. Next one, please.
- Control and monitor withdrawal from all sources.
- Periodically assess each water source, wetland and well.

And I think that's the last one. Yes, that's the last one of the groundwater recommendations.

And so they agree with these recommendations in principle. And they certainly have put forward in their evidence in the draft Environmental Protection Plan that they would, they would -- they plan to undertake these kinds of studies as part of monitoring for this project in order to ensure protection of the valuable groundwater resource in the area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fudge.

EVIDENCE BY MR. L'HENAFF
A. MR. L'HENAFF: So Mr. Chairman, just one final point kind of related to groundwater and that's
in relation to \(I\) guess our seal rock integrity. So -and it's kind of referenced in the NRCan presentation. No need to turn it up, but lower slide on page 25. So our seal rock is basically the Lea Park/Park Pakowky shale. And it ranges in between 60 to 120 metres thick. And I guess -- and I can say that it's been an effective trap holding gas in place for, you know, 65 million years. So we believe it is a very effective shale. And knowing that the viscosities between the gas and the water, water would have a more difficult time flowing through that, so. So just kind of a subtle point around our cap rock. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Heese.

\section*{EVIDENCE BY MR. HEESE}
A. MR. HEESE:

Mr. Chairman, I guess being the last, I feel that my legs are most at risk from being cut out, so \(I\) would request restraint as I might not be five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it's Mr. Denstedt you have to worry about, I think, more than me, so.
A. MR. HEESE: Thank you. I do, however, want to finish with discussing our track record. I've got three items to go over.

And the first one I'd like to begin with is actually in relation to a question that you asked with NRCan. And if they were aware of any gas developments in the National Wildlife Area that had triggered or reactivated any slumping.

And Mr. Martins offered a description of a well where SEAC had noted significant erosion. That well was 11-11-17-4.

My understanding of SEAC's primary concern was that a future access to the well and that comments about erosion were addressed as potential future considerations.

I have two photos of this well that I'm willing to provide as evidence if you would like. However, I'm not aware of any significant erosion on this location and \(I\) can confirm that it is 100 metres away from the coulee break.

I would also like to take the opportunity to describe the situation where -- the actual undertaking addressed. It was a question that Ms. Klimek had of DND in association with the slide on page 35 of the Government of Canada Opening Presentation, Exhibit 003-031. Scroll up, please. Specifically the image in the lower left of this composite.

I feel this is a good situation to describe in a little bit more detail what happened because it's an example of how we are responding to DND concerns and general concerns with the fact that this is now an area in the National Wildlife Area.

On August 14th, a general query did come to me about this location. It offered few specifics, but given that it was in the NWA, I assumed that there was a problem associated with this location.

I called SIRC and immediately went out in the field to conduct an investigation. I confirmed that there was an impact where some vehicles had driven off of Dugway to access a new well where some vehicles had gotten stuck in the sand on the side of the road.

I provided this information back to DND, included in that information, this was an e-mail to them, I included my recommendations for bringing back the area to a pre-disturbance contour using hand rakes and to also come in with a water truck to water the area to provide a slight crusting to give additional level of protection but then to allow natural recovery to take place.

At the same time as this, we immediately suspended the contractor who was responsible for this job and escorting the crews around in the area for two weeks without pay.

Once DND had reviewed the situation, they
gave me the opportunity to proceed and we cleaned up the location.

Finally, I would like to disagree with the general inference made in the Government of Canada's Opening Presentation that the frequency of compliance issues and our ability to manage environmental concerns is of great concern.

We stated early on in this hearing that we are not perfect, but we are committed to get better every day and to work hard to make sure that our operations are environmentally sustainable.

While the comments of SEAC describe a strong history of dealing with environmental concerns, I would like to describe again some of our existing programs:
- We have modified our
procedure to hand over wells from
our construction group to our
operations group to ensure there
are no deficiencies.
- We conduct post construction
check-ups one year after
construction.
- We conduct operational lease
inspections on all wells yearly.
- We are building a range
health program to track reclamation
trajectories.
- And we are continuously monitoring various species at risk.

Two days ago, you heard Mr. Denstedt query Ms. Gunther about the appropriate time to inspect our developments. I want to ensure you that DND, as the landowner, is welcome to conduct inspections of our operations. What gives me greatest concern, however, are the conclusions that are generated based on a snapshot in time generally without regard to the systems and processes EnCana has to deal with deficiencies.

As you are most likely aware, in EnCana's reply evidence, EnCana describes some of our concerns with the DND inspections of Koomati. In DND's inspections, trail proliferation was raised as a concern and EnCana recognized the deficiency in our reply.

However, it is important to see the progress made only one year later as can be seen in the lower slide of page 21 of the GOC Opening Statement in Exhibit 003-031.

This photograph of the D5 and D7 batteries
outside the NWA were some of the first drilling programs to use EnCana's redesigned access maps. One can see the drilling programs no longer have the randomness of access like the Koomati program.

Given that the Koomati program has received so much attention in spite of improvements on future programs like the one \(I\) just mentioned, \(I\) feel it is necessary to take a closer look at the DND Koomati inspection as \(I\) feel parts of it were a little unfair. This can be found in Exhibit 003-008. The first item I would like to explore is in the statement found in \(2 B\) on page 1 of 499 which is: "Vehicles accessing wells must do so in ways which minimize impact. In order to accomplish this, only one route should be used to access each well."

If we could now turn to \(P D F\) page 85 of 499 , would like to take a closer look at how the well of 7-18-17-4 is affected by this statement. Roughly halfway down the page, one can see that the number of access trails used to access the wellsite is recorded as three. Given the above statement, one would consider this location to be a failure. But when you take a closer look at the sketch on the bottom, and
understand the field, you understand why this well is the way it is.

Both the east/west and north/south access trails were existing trails serving existing wells. In order to minimize disturbance and new access trails, this wellsite was sited at the intersection of these existing trails. The third access is merely the path off the existing trail to reach the well. So while this location would fail if their criteria was that only one trail could be used, this is a perfectly legitimate situation where the well was located in an area to maximize the use of existing trails.

While we're on this inspection sheet, I'd like to point out the criteria used to identify rutting. You'll see, again, roughly halfway down the page, that the first rut category is zero to one centimetres.

DND is free to create whatever criteria they want to assess rutting. But in the 2006 inspection, on page 13 of 499, the expectation is laid out in discussion point 4 where it says:
"Two locations were recorded to
have no ruts on site in 2005 or
2006. This type of minimum
disturbance construction and
servicing procedures at CFB Suffield expects to see oil and gas companies following."

While we will continue to steward towards this expectation by maximizing the use of dry and frozen ground, \(I\) feel failing a location for a single depression less than one centimetre in depth is an unfair expectation given the size of equipment necessary for drilling and completing our wells.

While I do appreciate the overall tone or change in tone of the 2006 DND inspections, as it begins to recognize the temporary nature of construction impacts, I would like to comment on the last sentence of discussion point 6 on page 14 of 499 where it states:
"Noxious weed species accounted for some of the bare soil regrowth."

This was a surprising statement for me given that my own monitoring had failed to reveal a single noxious weed on our right-of-ways. DND's field sheets, however, failed to mention any noxious weeds, so I'm uncertain what the basis for this statement was.

Our operational lease inspections are continuously improving. One recent addition to the inspections was to take photographs of all wells to show the state of the well year by year. In order to balance the photos supplied by the Government of Canada and to allow the Panel to come to their own conclusions about the state of our developments, I have extracted some of the lease inspection photos for wells that have already been shown in evidence. However, some of these photographs are from different angles than what was originally presented. There are many more wells like these in the National Wildlife Area. I believe these were some of the wells Dr. Walker was referring to when he said it looks like someone just stuck a straw in the ground.

You'll note one of the locations does have a date of 2009 and I did not travel to the future to predict what it might look like.

These operational lease inspection photos help me focus my time on locations that need a little help and analyze what practices led to some of these amazing results.

I'm showing the Panel these photos, not only because they represent what EnCana has already done in the National Wildlife Area, but what we will be stewarding towards with every new well we hope to drill.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Heese.
Mr. Denstedt.

MR. DENSTEDT:
We were very close to the
hour. So this Panel is available to be cross-examined
in respect of the evidence they have filed this
afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Denstedt. I believe Ms. Klimek would like to have a few minutes to prepare.

Is that correct, Ms. Klimek?

MS. KLIMEK: Yes, I would like a few minutes to talk with my client and try to organize it to make it the most efficient possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, would 10 minutes, 15 minutes be sufficient?

MS. KLIMEK: I think we could do it in about 15 minutes. And I think Mr. Lambrecht would appreciate some time, too, so. Does that work for you?

THE CHAIRMAN:
Well, this is probably a good time to take a short break and then come back. Thank you.
(BRIEF BREAK)
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:05 P.M.)
(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 2:19 P.M.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe we're ready to
proceed, Ms. Klimek. You are quicker to the podium than I even thought here, so.

MS . KLIMEK:
Is it like I see the barn.

And after listening to my last undertaking, I want to keep these real short. But I notice, Mr. Lambrecht isn't here. Do we --

THE CHAIRMAN: Ah, yes, we can wait just a moment.

MS. KLIMEK: Do you want us to go stick our nose out and see --

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure he'll be here.

Let's just take a moment until he returns. And it may assist as well. He may have similar questions to your own. So we'll just hang on for a second.

MS. KLIMEK: Okay.
MR. DENSTEDT: Mr. Chairman, I'll take this opportunity, I don't think we marked these as an exhibit, so that's probably a useful use of the time. THE CHAIRMAN: Indeed. I meant to do that. The photographs you're speaking about?

MR. DENSTEDT: The photographs and the table.

THE CHAIRMAN:
Yes.

MR. DENSTEDT: sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: from there down. Yes. Thank you for reminding me, Mr. Denstedt.

MR. DENSTEDT:
The pictures are Exhibit 137 and the Table at 138.

EXHIBIT 137: Photographs submitted by EnCana during Rebuttal

EXHIBIT 138: Table regarding groundwater use
MR. DENSTEDT:
Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR. LAMBRECHT: Thank you, I'm sorry.
THE CHAIRMAN: No problem. Please proceed, Ms. Klimek.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE COALITION, BY MS. KIIMEK:

MS . KLIMEK:
Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Panel Members. Good afternoon, EnCana panel.
Q. I, I have just a few questions for you. And I have one for you, Mr. Collister, or a couple. How many snake surveys have you done in the NWA?
A. MR. COLLISTER: I've done one very low-intensity reconnaissance-type survey.
Q. And how long would it have taken you to do that?
A. It was just a couple of days.
Q. Now, Mr. Fudge, if we could go to the LandWise Report. And you were referring to pages, I think it was 111 to 113 as recommendations that EnCana is prepared to accept. Can we get that up?

Now, if we were to go to page 115, there's a recommendation to ensure adherence to site access recommendations. I notice that was --
A. MR. FUDGE: Excuse me, but I said with respect to groundwater and \(I\) said they accept in principle. And I did not say page 115; I said 111 to 113 as they apply to groundwater.
Q. And my question is, is this one that EnCana would be prepared to adhere to, this "ensure adherence to site access recommendations"?
A. As I said, I looked at this report for the -- on the groundwater aspects and I discussed the groundwater aspects of the report with EnCana staff. And their hydrogeologist, in-house hydrogeologist. We did not look -- I did not look specifically at that and that was not my task.
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Heese, I'd like to talk a little bit about the incident that was referred to with the picture at page 35. And what were the crews doing on that site? What were they out there doing?
A. MR. HEESE: They were conducting a
production casing integrity log.
Q. And does the Base require EnCanada -- EnCana to get a permit for that activity?
A. We had been in discussions with DND about the requirements for permits for various types of activities.
Q. Has -- did the Base at that time require EnCana to get permits for those activities?
A. This was not an activity we understood was a require -- the permit was required at that time.
Q. And do you know if you required an NWA permit to do that activity?
A. As, as a result of our discussions, and the DND did provide a routine activity permit already as an example, of course with the cover letter that was attached, once we signed that permit, we effectively agreed, again, subject to the contents of the cover letter, to abide by those conditions for those activities. The activities that were not covered by that permit are still under discussion with the Military.
Q. And was this activity covered by that permit?
A. By the one that was signed?
Q. Yes.
A. As the Military explained, that was essentially light
vehicle traffic, and the vehicles that are required for this particular activity I think would be outside of what the intent was in the original permit that they supplied us with.
Q. Now was it your understanding, in spite of your discussions, that DND did want EnCana to get permits for those activities?
A. Again, I think the cover letter that was supplied with the permit outlines EnCana's situations. We had been in discussions for quite some time with the various equipment and various things that we might need to do to our wells out there. And upon signing of that condition, again, subject to the contents of the cover letter, we agreed to have those conditions apply to essentially light vehicle traffic. Heavier vehicle traffic is still under discussion.
Q. Okay, but while it's under discussion, do you understand that DND's position is that you should be getting permits until this is resolved?
A. And I believe that cover letter makes it clear --
Q. Well --
A. -- that there is currently before the courts whether or not permits are required on any of our existing facilities and whether or not those are grandfathered. So discussions are continuing in regards to the
heavier vehicles.
MS. KLIMEK: Those are all my questions.
Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Klimek.
Mr. Lambrecht?
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, BY

MR. LAMBRECHT

MR. LAMBRECHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a few and they are going to be reasonably straightforward, I would think.
Q. I would like to start with Dr. Walker. And Dr. Walker, it's just simply to clarify one of the, one or more of the pictures that you were using in your presentation. As I understand it, those pictures showed a caisson installed in the NWA; is that correct? And if it is, could you pull that up just so as we can see.
A. DR. WALKER: Yes, that looks like a caisson.
Q. And, and that's in the NWA?
A. Well, I'd have to check the -- but you do make a point. It shouldn't have a caisson if it was 2001.
Q. I think my point is there are caissons in the NWA, and if we were to have a picture of one, they would look like, something like that?
A. Yes, that is, that is in the NWA. That's just off of Dugway Road to the east, the top of the hill.
Q. All right. Thank you. And Mr. Heese and Mr. L'Henaff, a question for you. And it's really just one of terminology. Many times throughout the evidence the term "lease" has been used. But my understanding is there are no leases as those terms are understood on private land in Alberta, so that entry onto the Base is through the Surface Access Agreement and it's not then overlaid or reinforced by any other instrument called a "lease". Is that correct?
A. MR. HEESE: Well, it's correct that our activities are covered under the Surface Access Agreements. We have effectively been using a deemed lease of 100 by 100 metres for all shallow gas locations.
Q. But the term "lease" is just a term used to refer to that area?
A. Generally the word "lease" is referred outside the block to a specific well area and access trail, that's correct.
Q. But outside the block there will be leases, actual leases, instruments, legal instruments, and there's no such thing here inside the block?
A. Our access is governed by the Surface Access Agreements.
Q. Yes, yes, thank you. Okay. Mr. Collister, your suggestion -- did \(I\) understand you to suggest that the critical habitat for Sprague's Pipit should extend into the National Training Area part of the block?
A. MR. COLLISTER: From my understanding of the evidence that has been -- that was submitted by Environment Canada and, and the process and the methodology that was used to calculate preliminarily assessed critical habitat for Sprague's Pipit, with the caveat that RSFs to me are a bit of a black box, but, nevertheless, and with -- and having been out on both the MTA, doing surveys on both the MTA and the NWA, seeing habitat on both, there certainly is higher, higher disturbance occurring on the MTA side, but it's hard for me to see a difference between those two in terms of how, of how that model would predict preliminarily assessed critical habitat if it was applied to the MTA.
Q. And you understand that an extension of critical habitat into the MTA would have quite significant implication for your client, EnCana?
A. I think, I think what I would understand from, from my
suggestion is, in fact, it's likely that if that model was applied to almost any piece of prairie in Western Canada, it would come out as preliminarily assessed critical habitat for Sprague's Pipit and would not be very useful.
Q. All right. But would you dispute the proposal that it's important to start somewhere to designate critical habitat for the Sprague's Pipit?
A. I think if it was done in an objective way, without being brought to bear in a particular situation with potentially a particular purpose, that it would be, yes.
Q. All right. And so you're thinking that the use of a National Wildlife Area to start for the purposes of designation of critical habitat isn't objective; is that what you're saying?
A. No, that's not what I'm saying.
Q. Okay. Can I ask you a question about your two two-week studies in 2006.
A. Yes.
Q. You were referring to Table 5J1.
A. Yes.
Q. My understanding is that the precipitation was very good in that year; is that correct?
A. I think it was, yes.
Q. And that would naturally affect the number of birds that would appear in that study period?
A. I'm not, I'm not sure about that, Mr. Lambrecht. You could consult with your own experts there who have put forward, \(I\) think, that it's, for some species at least, it's, it's more important to consider the previous year's levels of precipitation. So it's a complicate, it's a complicated issue just what climatic variables are affecting these species and how.
Q. All right. Now, I just wanted to get some clarity around the bird surveys of the NWA. My note may not be accurate, so \(I\) just want to get some sort of final opportunity to get clarity around the scope of the proposed bird surveys for the NWA. Is the entire NWA to be surveyed for all birds or some birds?
A. Are you speaking about the PDA or the monitoring program?
Q. The PDA process, as \(I\) understand it. You were talking about the PDA process. And you were saying that the Burrowing Owl survey would cover the entire NWA. Did I understand that --

MR. DENSTEDT: Sorry, if the question is specifically about the Burrowing Owl, which was the point that Mr. Collister was trying to clear up, I'm
fine with that. But if my friend has remembered a few questions he should have asked earlier, that's his problem.

MR. LAMBRECHT: Well, I just -- I would be happy to leave the uncertainty around and just get to the Burrowing Owl.
Q. Is the Burrowing Owl survey going to be done for the entire NWA?
A. Yes. But it will be phased over three years, so there would -- so a third of -- the third of the NWA that is going to be constructed or subject to shallow gas infill development in the following winter, the preceding summer, that area of the NWA would be surveyed so that it would be right up to date and relevant to the construction period.
Q. All right. Thank you. And, Mr. Fudge, I have a couple questions for you, then. I was struck by -you were going through the numbers, but I understood you to say that they were all very vague with and you had very low levels of confidence in them. Did that phrase "very low levels of confidence" apply to the estimates of groundwater use because the recordkeeping with respect to groundwater extraction in the recent years isn't very thorough or robust?
A. MR. FUDGE: I was speaking not to the
prediction of use, because it's pretty well-established that it takes 165 , or thereabouts, cubic metres of water to drill and complete a well, that sort of thing. So EnCana, after drilling 10,000 wells have a pretty good idea of what their usage is. I was referring to the estimates made by various firms, including LandWise and their predecessors, on what is the availability of groundwater in the NWA. And when you really look at it, they don't really have a great handle on it. And everybody's got a different number. And when I see 100 percent difference, or greater, in different reports, I'm thinking, yeah, its, its, a bit -- this is not nailed down and this is not based on empirical data that's strong. They have a few data points. They are extrapolating a lot. They are doing some arm waving. And I think LandWise admits, and I don't take them to task for it, that there's a very conservative estimate of groundwater availability in the major Lethbridge aquifer in, within CFB Suffield, and adjacent areas. That's what I meant.
Q. All right, but \(I\) heard numbers of \(35,45,55\), and 139 . But I think LandWise does say at page 30 of its report that groundwater withdrawal records from 2005 to 2007 are much less detailed than the previous.
A. Could we bring them up? I'd have to look at that.
Q. Yes, please. That's page 30 of the LandWise Report, which is exhibit, as \(I\) understand it, 003A.
A. Would you like me to go through my presentation again for your benefit so you could understand the 55, the 35, and the other numbers that I quoted, because I thought I was fairly clear, and I actually asked a number of people "Did you actually understand that?" Because the 35 and the 55, let's not try to, you know, jumble the numbers together. They are different numbers. They mean different things. And the sources of that information are different.
Q. I'd be quite happy just to look at page 30 and -- of the LandWise Report. And it's under the heading "Withdrawal and Water Level Records at Water Source Wells." And then the second paragraph there, first sentence (as read):
"Groundwater withdrawal records from 2005 to 2007 are much less detailed. Water amounts are generally only recorded as total withdrawal per quarter rather than withdrawal at each pumping interval. Where meter readings were recorded for certain pumping

> intervals, the meter was reset to zero after each pumping episode so cumulative water withdrawal amounts cannot be checked with recorded withdrawal amounts per quarter."

The point \(I\) just wanted to make is that the recordkeeping isn't robust in the recent years with respect to groundwater withdrawal. And I'm asking if you would agree with that.
A. I don't know if "robust" is the, is the proper word, but certainly there can be improvement made. And I believe in the acceptance of the groundwater monitoring or recommendations in the LandWise Report, EnCana's hydrogeologist has recognized -- recognizes that better recordkeeping should be, should be kept in -- as in an ongoing basis, as we go forward, regardless of the Project.

And in fact, a number of investigations and studies are underway by EnCana in-house, quite divorced from these proceedings, to get a better understanding of, of the whole area. And, and, in particular, the different layers of, of groundwater, the pre-glacial aquifer, so-called Lethbridge aquifer, and the glacial sands and gravels above that, and the conduct -- the connectivity of those, of those upper
aquifers to actually wetlands and the separation, which, by the way, in the LandWise Report, speaking of the connection between groundwater and wetlands, they do suggest in their report that the deeper groundwater in the pre-glacial sediments is not connected strongly to the wetlands. In fact, it's the upper aquifer, a much smaller aquifer, that is not typically drawn by these wells. Like the Dugway, "Big Bob", et cetera, they draw from the deeper aquifer. They suggest in the LandWise Report they are not strongly connected to the, the, glacial sediments and the wetlands above, so -- which is, which is a good thing. And I was pleased to read that.

And EnCana's investigating that right now in terms of doing isotope studies on water from these different zones. Thank you.
Q. Would you agree that a water budget is a good idea?
A. Yes, a water budget is a good idea. And EnCana's hydrogeologist has said he's undertaking one. And the problem I think really lies in the overall
understanding of the regional groundwater itself. And, as \(I\) say, when you look at these results, they are varied.

What we do know is that the, the wells that are proposed to be used mainly by EnCana are in a very
good water supply area, they have not been drawn down, their levels are not decreasing, they recover very well. And Mr. McNeil suggests that those are the kind -- those are the wells that can be taken from. Also you have to remember that EnCana is not proposing to use only groundwater. They are -- they have a licence to take 70,000 cubic metres of water out of the, out of the, out of the South Saskatchewan River during the, that winter period.

They typically in the past have taken something in the order of 10,000 , with the 70,000 licence. And the City of Medicine Hat supplies water for the water trucks on their way in. They arrive at the, at CFB Suffield full of water from, from the city.

So there's a variety of sources both ground and surface that can be used. And a rigorous monitoring program and recordkeeping will ensure that if there's any, any kinds of problems, any problems can be anticipated, in a go-forward basis.
Q. Mr. Collister, I just have a few fine questions with you, sir, and it's with respect to the question of snake mortality.
A. MR. COLLISTER: M'mm-hmm.
Q. With respect to the evidence given by Mr. Didiuk
regarding the 575 females and then his extrapolation on that in sort of a mortality example, my understanding is that number of females was taken from the study which was much smaller than the entire National Wildlife Area. Would you agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And you agree that his recommendations which are at page 48 to 50 of Exhibit 003-051 are good recommendations?
A. 48 to 50, the ones I referred to?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. And is it fair to say that there's a disagreement between yourself and Mr. Didiuk over the likeliness of population decline in rattlesnake populations?
A. As a result of this Project?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. And would you agree with me that with respect to speed limits, generally, regardless of the speed of the vehicle, driver attentiveness is still an important factor in snake mortality. I mean, you can go as slow a you like, but if you're not looking for the snakes, you won't avoid them even if you have time to do so?
A. I think that's true. And, you know, of course, there's an intention here for EnCana to -- and their operators already are aware of and know that that's an issue and they are looking for snakes.

But another, another thing that hasn't been touched on in that regard, Mr. Lambrecht, is that, is that people develop search images for things that people are interested in and trying to see. And I know I have experience, you know, a lot of experience with, with taking folks out to watch birds or do natural history things and it's amazing how people can't see things the first time they are exposed to looking at things. But if they are trying to and after a little -- with a little bit of experience, they can get very, very good at it. And even things that are very cryptic can be seen quite, quite quickly and quite easily, so.

I think with, with the emphasis on, on looking for snakes and at the kind of speed we're talking about, 50 kilometres per hour, we've already stated that, undoubtedly, there will be a small amount of mortality but that it will be small. And the 50 kilometre per hour speed limit will, will make a big difference.
Q. And then, finally, the recommendations of Mr. Didiuk
that you said were good, my ear heard that you said they had formed the basis of EnCana's proposed mitigation measures. When you say that they formed the basis of them, do you mean that EnCana adopted those recommendations or that they looked at those recommendations and then took some to form mitigation --
A. EnCana didn't look at those recommendations. I did. And I made the recommendation to, then to EnCana, as to the package of recommendations that are included in the EIS.
Q. Right, so some but not all of Mr. Didiuk's recommendations are in the EIS?
A. Yeah, I'd have done. Yeah, that was quite a while ago now, and I -- year, and I'm sure that it's not -- that I couldn't line everything up, that's right. I looked through and looked for the most significant ones. And I didn't leave any out for any particular reason, other than that maybe --
Q. Right, and so if we look in the EIS and compare that with the Didiuk recommendations, we can see what the differences are?
A. Yeah, you'll see the similarities, right.
Q. And differences as well?
A. Yes. Yes.

MR. LAMBRECHT:
All right, well, listen, thank you, gentlemen. You've been very good and I appreciate your time.
A. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lambrecht. Mr. Mousseau.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE JOINT PANEL SECRETARIAT, BY MR . MOUSSEAU :

MR. MOUSSEAU:
Q. Just one question, and I think it's for Mr. Fudge, and I'm not certain what falls out of it, but if \(I\) look at the average, average use for the South Jenner and the Beverage (phonetic), I assume they are wells, it's greater than the allocation and I'm just wondering if you can comment on that.
A. MR. FUDGE: Excuse me, Mr. Mousseau, which, which -- what are you looking at exactly?
Q. I'm looking at the table.
A. Oh, the table I did up --
Q. Yeah, you passed out today and it just sort of caught my eye, so.
A. Yes. Well, okay, so the South Jenner is an interesting case in itself. It's far in the northwest, yeah, northwest corner of the Suffield Base. As far away from the NWA as you can possibly
get. It's way up there. It has not recovered as well as some of the other wells. And, of course, this is an average based on past use, right. The -- this is 2004/2005 years averaged.

And I think the Province, in granting their licence for this well, want to make sure that the allocation is kept under 5,000 because of past performance. If you go back to those tables that we looked at earlier, \(I\) don't suggest you do, but if you've got any spare time or anything, you can. You can see that the South Jenner well does not bounce back as, say, Dugway and "Big Bob" have.

So that's the reason there.

This is a 2008 allocation. This is use in the past, right, so, yeah, it -- the Province, I believe, has brought that down looking at the well records that are part of the licensing and the reporting on that right and they have said, "Yeah, we better..." so I don't actually -- I'm not aware of what the allocation was in the past. I guess it was higher, I assume. And, anyway, that's -- that well, for whatever reason, up in the northwest part of the block, and it's right in the very corner of the northwest corner of the block, it's, for whatever, reason seems to have not responded quite as well.

Perhaps the aquifer -- the aquifer is not the same one as the Dugway/"Big Bob", the Lethbridge aquifer, so. That's, that's all \(I\) can tell you.
Q. And is it the same for the Beverage, because that one looks like the average use is considerably above the allocation?
A. Yeah, again, those are the allocations of the past. And the Province has granted that temporary licence at that level.
Q. Oh, so these are, these are temporary?
A. But \(I\) think the Beverage, actually, is a pretty good, pretty good well. Looks like a good performer and it doesn't show decline. But \(I\) can't, \(I\) can't really tell you what Alberta Environment's got in mind there.
Q. Okay, so, that just gives -- I think you just said these were temporary, but I think in your earlier evidence you said that these -- I think what you told me that these were temporary permits but in your earlier evidence you said that these were licences, so --
A. Okay, sorry.
Q. -- is there a disconnect there?
A. Yeah, I'm sorry about that. I apologize. I have them here, by the way, if you'd like copies. I have copies. But Dugway and "Big Bob" are licences.
Q. Okay.
A. Telfor, Beverage, South Jenner are temporary licences.
Q. Okay. That's helpful, sir. Thank you.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, those are my questions.

THE CHAIRMAN:
Thank you, Mr. Mousseau.

I'll check with the Panel. Mr. DeSorcy, no. Dr. Ross?

\section*{QUESTIONS BY THE CHAIRMAN:}

THE CHAIRMAN:
Q. I just have one question for you, Mr. Fudge, and thank you for the efforts to try and clear the issue of groundwater. Yesterday, in the testimony from National Defence we received some information that indicates they are likely to go back to the use of groundwater for the Base at Suffield. And I'm not sure if, if they are drawing from the same aquifer or not, but my question to you is, is, based on your knowledge of the groundwater, is the renewed use of groundwater by the Base likely to have an effect on, on the aquifer and potentially these wells?
A. MR. FUDGE: That was -- it was a bit unclear to me, sir, when I listened to that, because I can find it, if you give me a moment, but there's actually a quote from one of the witnesses from --
that was on the DND panel in the LandWise Report. I don't have it right in front of me, here, but I could find it. It's in this report. And it states, I forget the person's name, it's one of the, one of the DND civilian personnel. Anyway, she quotes the usage was about half a million cubic metres of water in 19 -- in 2007, but they shut it down in 2007. And she gives the dates even, of, of the use and when it was shut down, and now they are on, on river water.

And that's, that's all. It's stated in there, this report. And it seemed to be a lot fuzzier in terms of the, "No, well, I heard that they were -- they had used groundwater in the past, they are using river water now, there's issues." But in this report, which is pretty recent, it's pretty specific, they were on groundwater, now they're on river water, I couldn't speak for what their plans are in the future. Obviously with groundwater they have a problem with sand and with dissolved solids I guess in there.
Q. Yes, that was my understanding.
A. Yeah, and so -- but it is interesting that, just to make it even a little fuzzier, in the LandWise Report, if we were to go back to that, the table that shows the allocation of water of, what was it, around 400,000 , or whatever the number is, 450,000 , you know, what they estimate is the available groundwater, they don't take into consideration the half a million that the Base was taking. Like it's not in those numbers. That's why I didn't want to bring it up because it just makes things more complex, but that's why I try and say, this whole groundwater thing, like, what supply is available. It just seems to me like nobody has a really good handle on it. They don't have that good a handle on it. So they didn't even -- they, they found out, apparently, just as this was already in draft or just about finished, they found out that the Base was taking half a million a year out of the aquifer and we're not seeing any, we're not seeing any decline in other areas of that aquifer.

And there's some questions: What are the connections and are there a lot of lateral flow, say, coming in from the Bow River, that kind of thing.

But I thought that was a very positive thing for groundwater in the region if they stop taking half a million a day.
Q. I recall you said that in your earlier testimony --
A. Yes, that's right. Yeah, I thought it was a positive thing. But I can't really speak to what the effects are because during the time they are taking half a
million out, say there has not been any significant, or there hasn't been any changes to ground, groundwater levels that I'm aware of, except at a well close to the Base itself, if you look at it, and in the Medicine Hat area. And, again, that's noted in the LandWise study. It's noted that there's a bit of groundwater level decline in the area of Medicine Hat, but they are pulling out 6,000 cubic metres a day in Medicine Hat. They are using a lot of groundwater there, so. And that's agricultural use, et cetera, multiple uses there.

So with the exception of those two wells which are near municipal areas, in municipal areas that have high levels of groundwater water use, the rest of the broad area seems to be in pretty good shape. And, in fact, in some cases it seems to be increasing levels, so.
Q. Okay, if \(I\) understand you, what you're saying is that the recharge rate for the other wells has really not changed through that same period?
A. That's correct. And there is a suggestion, too, that it's not -- there's got -- there's obviously recharge -- and, again, this is talking to McNeil and others -- there's some lateral recharge coming in either from the South Saskatchewan or Bow into this
aquifer or perhaps even from the north, from the Red Deer River. It's not just precipitation that's recharging. This is a deep pre-glacial aquifer which is a solid aquifer to draw on, it seems.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fudge. Mr. Denstedt, did you wish to re-direct?

MR. DENSTEDT: I have one question and it's for Mr. Collister.

\section*{RE-EXAMINATION BY DENSTEDT:}

MR. DENSTEDT:
Q. Mr. Lambrecht asked you a couple questions about preliminary assessed critical habitat. And if it would be useful to start somewhere. And I guess my question to you, Mr. Collister, is what do you think of the, what do you think of the approach taken by Environment Canada to their preliminary assessment of critical habitat?
A. MR. COLLISTER:

Well, I guess to add to, to my comments, it, it seems to me that if -- that in terms of critical habitat, it needs to be applied, it needs to be applied broadly. And, in this case, I think it was mentioned this morning, it seemed to have been a reaction to the, to this Project and the NWA. And I guess that just doesn't seem like an objective approach to assessing or, or to assessing critical
habitat; in this case preliminarily assessed critical habitat.
Q. I was actually thinking about the actual approach taken as opposed to the more nebulous --
A. Oh, the methodology, sir?
Q. Well, the approach taken by them.
A. Well, I, I -- you know, as I mentioned, I'm somewhat familiar with the methodology that was used. And to a certain extent. I got lost in the RSF a little bit. But it seems to me that, for that particular species, having such a broad application isn't really helpful in terms of, in terms of conserving the species.

MR. DENSTEDT: I'm not going to ask any more questions. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Denstedt.

This brings us to a conclusion. And I would like to, first of all, thank the panel for returning to present rebuttal evidence.
(ENCANA REBUTTAL PANEL EXCUSED)
THE CHAIRMAN:
And I'd like to thank
everyone at this point for the evidence that they have brought forward to us during these proceedings, for all of the questions that have been posed and the answers received. This has been of great assistance to us in having a better understanding of the proposed

Project and its potential implications. So I thank all of you for your contribution here in these proceedings.

Our next meeting for final argument will be next Thursday, October 30th, and we will meet at the same time at 8:30 in the morning. We also have Friday reserved if, if needed, as well the next day.

So I look forward to seeing you again next Thursday. Thank you for your attendance. And I wish you a good weekend and a good few days off from this hearing. Bye for now.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 3:00 P.M.)
(PROCEEDINGS TO RECONVENE AT 8:30 A.M. ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30TH, 2008)
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\hline vehicles [7] - 3872:25 & water [41] - 3829:22, 3834:2, & & 3838:5, 3841:20, 3842:13, \\
\hline 3897:4, 3942:24, 3959:10, & 3946:5, 3946:15, 3946:17, 3946:24, 3947:12, & 3953:3, 3953:10, 3953:13, & 3:11, 3844:18, 3846:3, \\
\hline 3959:11, \({ }^{\text {Vehicles [2] - 3934:13 }}\) & 3947:15, 3947:19, 3948:6, & 3954:9, & :4, 3864:6 \\
\hline 3962:13 & :9, 3950:14, 3950:21 & 62:13, 3963:4, 3964:9, & 5:15, 3866:1, 3867:21 \\
\hline verb [2] - \(3851: 1,3851: 2\) & :12, 3951:13, & 5:1, 3965:7, 3965:10, & 9:24, 3877:10, 3898 \\
\hline Verbena [2]-3814:12, & :15, 3951:19, 3954:4 & 5:11, 3971:12, 3978:5, & 00:16, 3901:19, \\
\hline & 16, & 81:8, 3981:24, 3982 & 3905:17, 3911:2, 3914:5 \\
\hline vericable [1] - 3819:9 & 7:10, 3959:17, 3978:3, & 13, 3987:2, 3989:21, & WHIDDEN [21] - 3795:16, \\
\hline Vermillion [1] - 3816 & :3, 3981:15, 3981:17 & 2:12, 3992:19 & 4:17, 3824:2 \\
\hline versa [1] - 3916:11 &  & wellsite [5] - 3928:13 & 3824:23, 3825:5, 3836:13, \\
\hline vertebral [1] - 3877: & 3982:12, 3982:13, & \(1: 2,3931: 3,3962: 2\) & 3838:12, 3840:2, 3842:2, \\
\hline viability [4] - 3877:1,
\(3934: 10,3935: 6,3937 \cdot 13\) & 3990:14 3990:17 & 3963:6 & 42:19, 3843:13, 3845:8, \\
\hline 3934:10, \(3935: 6,3937: 13\)
viable \([4]-3797: 11,3910: 2\) &  & wellsites [5] - 3889:7 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 64:10, 3868:1, 3898: } \\
& \text { 55:25, 3911:7, 3912: }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline viable [4] - 3797:11, 391 3916:4, 3916:11 & waterbodies [1] - 3815:1 & 3896:11, 3929:9, 3931.
3940:8 & 3912:17, 3914:9, 3916: \\
\hline vice \({ }_{[1]}\) - 3916:11 & watertable [1] - 395 & wellsiting & Whidden's [1] \\
\hline videoclip [1] - 3809:1 & waving [1] - 3978:1 ways [10] - 3803:13, & Western [4] - 3806:19, & Whiddens [2] - 3792:5, 3839:8 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { view }[12]-3853: 22,3873: 13, \\
& 3875: 16,3893: 12,
\end{aligned}
\] & 3814:13, 3872:20, 3873 & 3806:22, 3924:4, 3975 & white [1] - 3833:23 \\
\hline 3875:16, 3893:12, & 3880:3, 3923:21, 3931:10, & 3816:4, 3816:8, 3816:10, & white-tailed [1] - 3833:2 \\
\hline 3914:6, 3914:7, 3915:10, & & 6:20, 3816:24, 3889:8, & ole [3] - 3950:1 \\
\hline 3931:23, 3948:2 & weather \([1]\) - 3941:10 & 889:22, 3956:10 & 3980:21, 3991 \\
\hline violating [1] - 3823:4 & & Wetland [1] - 3815:14 & wide [4] - 3871:7, 3875:8 \\
\hline viscosities [1] - 3957:10 & Wednesday \({ }^{[1]}-3\) & nds [2] - 3889 & 40:6, 3940:1 \\
\hline visible [1] - 3844:6 & \[
\text { Weed }[1]-3896 \text { : }
\] & 3894:4 & 5011 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { visit }[6]-3805: 7,3805: 21, \\
& 3813: 19,3820: 19,
\end{aligned}
\] & weed [5] - 3804:24, 3879: & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { wetlands }[27]-3797: 11, \\
3815: 13,3815: 15,3817:
\end{gathered}
\] & width [2]-3850:11, 3883:17
widths [3] - 3849:9, 3850:2, \\
\hline 3862:18, 3863:12 & 3895:25, 3964:16, 3964:20 & 3817:11, 3817:22, & 3850:14 \\
\hline visuals [1] - 3920:12 & weeds [11] - & 819.8, \(3822 \cdot 18\) & [1] - 3806: \\
\hline vitae [2] - 3836:11, 3837:3 & & 9:23, 3833:1, 3834:3 & Id [1] - 3807:1 \\
\hline Vitae [4] - 3792:3, 3792:5,
3839:3, 3839:7 & \begin{tabular}{l}
2:25, 3880:22, 3883:9 \\
84:2, 3884:6, 3897:18,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3889: 3,3889: 4,3889: 7, \\
& 3889: 12,3894: 12,
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
wildfires [1] - 3924:12 \\
Wildlife [31] - 3795:23,
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Volume [4] - 3936:24, 3938:4, 3945:18, 3952:6 & \[
\begin{gathered}
3897: 21,3964: 21 \\
\text { weedy }[4]-3807: 14,
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
3894:17, 3949:1, 3955:7, \\
3955:8, 3981:1, \(3981: 3\),
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
3804:1, 3825:1, 3825:2, \\
3825:8, 3825:22, 3825:24,
\end{tabular} \\
\hline VOLUME [1] - 3789:16 volumes [1] - 3908:12 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3820:21, 3880:2, 3904:7 \\
week [6] - 3816:1, 3840:3,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3981: 6,3981: 11 \\
& \text { wheat }[2]-3800: 20,3801: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3825: 25,3826: 18, \\
& 3826: 20,3830: 6,3831: 1,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

