



**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION  
FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL  
TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024**

---

Consent Agenda Item 7.5      Public input received May 18, 2024, from M. Langegger regarding Consent Agenda Item 7.5, For Information Only Report, Provincial Referral #168868683, Notice of Work, Progressive Ventures Limited Partnership, Claque Mountain (1.4.2.18.8).

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**From:** Michael [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 18, 2024 12:35 AM  
**To:** Warren Waycheshen <[wwaycheshen@kitimat.ca](mailto:wwaycheshen@kitimat.ca)>  
**Subject:** Mnt Clague Quarry Comments

Hi Warren,

I provided comment on the Clague Quarry file to the Province. Not sure if I shared this with Council and staff. The response to the Province also contained a series of supporting pictures, and is public record.

I just reviewed further information on this file in the package for the upcoming Council meeting and was concerned with the lack of detail and information provided on this file:

- Registered Trapline holder noted as unknown – It's [REDACTED]
- Identifies that there are no wildlife conservation initiatives within 5 Km of the site – This is false the Kitimat Rod and Gun has installed a number of fisher nesting boxes some within 5 km of the site. This project was funded by the Habitat Conservation Trust fund, and was supported by a provincial biologist. The Kitimat Rod and gun is currently evaluating a fisheries project on Goose Creek and will be engaging Haisla Fisheries, DFO, and Province soon for their feedback and approval.
- It notes that no listed species are within 5 km of the quarry site – false, fisher, grizzly bear, wolverine to mention a few have been identified within 5 km of the quarry site. I see moose range mapping has been done by the Province and is included, but do not see any grizzly habitat mapping. This was done in our valley but stopped at Municipal boundaries. It is important for the health and well being of grizzly bears that they be able to travel to and from the estuary and don't believe this has been considered in any plan. I'm aware of some studies in the estuary, but none that looks at travel corridors from estuary, to alpine, along rivers and streams to access important food, breeding, and hibernating habitats.
- Notes that the project is not within a watershed area – Goose Creek is a nearby watershed, runoff from the quarry site will enter this stream which enters the Kitimat River directly above the community water intake. Also mentions a settling pond on the quarry site and is concerning from a public health and water security point of view.
- There's mention of trees being left around the site to protect the areas visual appeal – Quarry operation in Kitimat have had a significant impact on our communities visual appeal, Just stand at the view point and look towards the village road, then look west and above the sand hill to see visual quarrying scars.

This is a great example of why Kitimat desperately needs Council to support a motion to create an Environmental Advisory Commission. If we had such a commission to review, and advise Council on such matters provides great value in aiding sound decision making. This in a way that

is cost effective, engages community volunteers, incorporates local knowledge, build relationships, provides sound advice for consideration, supports openness and transparency.

Below written comment submitted to the Province.

Mike Langegger

Subject: Land Act Notice for Disposition of Crown Land - Application #6409450

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Kitimat Rod and Gun Association, an affiliate of the BCWF, appreciates the opportunity to offer comments on file #6409450 regarding an application for a License of Occupation for a Quarry.

Upon reviewing the management plan, we have identified several issues, inconsistencies, and gaps in critical information that merit your attention.

### 1. Lack of Clarity in Project Overview

Under 1.1 Project Overview, the statement "No secondary commercial or industrial uses are anticipated on the project site" lacks the assurance needed to preclude such developments. Given the proposed change in zoning status from G5-Forestry to Industrial, without accurate justification, raises concerns about the accuracy of claims made in the Kitimat Official Community Plan.

### 2. Environmental Impact Concerns

Significant opposition has been expressed by local NGOs and Kitimat residents due to the area's high recreational values, critical habitat, wetlands, fisheries values, wildlife connectivity, ecosystem, tourism potential, and social values. Moreover, the proximity of Goose Creek, a critical water source, requires stringent measures to ensure zero risk to public water security, health, and safety.

### 3. Inadequate Investigative Work

The management plan lacks comprehensive investigative work related to fish and wildlife, existing recreational uses, other tenured uses, hydrology, water quality concerns, and cumulative impacts assessment. This omission raises questions about the thoroughness of the application.

#### 4. Misleading Statements

Statements like "There are no known water courses in proximity to the proposed activity" under 2.1 Location are misleading, as Goose Creek, a significant water course, is directly downhill from the proposed site. This misrepresentation jeopardizes the credibility of the entire proposal.

#### 5. Lack of Consideration for Cumulative Impacts

The plan does not address the potential impacts on the Kitimat River, Goose Creek, and the surrounding environment during high water events, posing a significant oversight.

#### 6. Inadequate Risk Mitigation Measures

Insufficient attention has been given to Goose Creek, a high-value fisheries spawning and rearing habitat, and the proposed measures to mitigate risks to water quality and wildlife.

#### 7. Environmental Reclamation

The estimated reclamation cost of \$50,000 seems undervalued, and the lack of a sunset clause and assurance of defensible reclamation is a concern. A financial bond may be necessary to ensure proper site restoration.

#### 8. Lack of Cumulative Impact Assessment

The assertion that "No impact to fish or wildlife is anticipated" lacks supporting evidence, such as a cumulative impact assessment, wildlife connectivity assessment, and hydrology assessment.

#### 9. Socio-Community Impact

The statement claiming positive effects on socio-community conditions lacks substantive evidence. The assumption about baseline recreation values is unfounded, overlooking the area's high recreational use and potential tourism benefits.

In conclusion, we appreciate the chance to provide comments and eagerly await your response.

Sincerely,

Mike Langedger

Kitimat Rod and Gun Association