



Present:	Mayor:	P. Germuth
Present:	Councillors:	E. Empinado, M. Feldhoff, G. Leibel, M. Martins, T. Marleau, G. Pitzel
Present:	Staff:	W. Waycheshen, Chief Administrative Officer K. Enders, Director of Corporate Administration T. Tavares, Deputy Director of Corporate Administration A. Ramos-Espinoza, Director of Engineering Services J. Dave, IT Technician J. Christiansen-Liptak, Environmental Services Manager W. Tenshak, Director of Economic Development M. Gould, Director of Leisure Services D. Rutsatz, Director of Finance M. Penner, Director of Labour Relations and Human Resources C. McCulley, Director of Operations Randy Lambright, District of Kitimat Planning Consultant L. Ferreira, Planning Administrative Assistant
Via WebEx		
Via WebEx		
Via WebEx		
Via WebEx		

The Public Hearing is being held pursuant to the Local Government Act to consider the Land Use Designations, Forest License Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 2029, 2023 and G5 Forestry Zone Amendment Bylaw No. 2030, 2023.

The Corporate Officer and District of Kitimat Planning Consultant provided an overview of the proposed amendments to Bylaw No. 2029, 2023 and Bylaw No. 2030, 2023.

There were no written comments submitted.

Mayor Germuth called for public input.

Hunter Wild, Kitimat, posed the following questions:

- Will the area on the mountain be clear cut?
 - The intent would not be for the entire area to be clear cut but they will obviously go in phases so there will be portions that will be under development and then move onto the next phase
- How much will be clear cut initially?
 - I don't have that available and something that they will have to work through with the District Engineering and staff
- Is any of that area old growth?
 - Director of Engineering advised not to his knowledge and didn't think any had been identified
- Will the clear cut area be visible from town?
 - Planning consultant advised that per the visuals submitted, it will not be any different from what you can currently see from town. It's not very visible, from his and the District's perspective.
- Will cutting down that many trees destabilize the slope?
 - Director of Engineering advised that according to their geotechnical, they have done their analysis and the area is stable in accordance with submitted plans.

- I think about Haisla Boulevard and that slope that was cut down which is quite a bit smaller than what is proposed and that has destabilized right because of the cutting down of trees.
 - Staff asked for clarification of that slope
- At the viewpoint where they did all willow branch things. They did the willow branches because it was destabilized, the idea was to plan more trees after they had cut them down to restabilize the slope.
 - The Director of Engineering advised they did not have any information on this
 - The Director of Leisure Services requested clarification of the question from Hunter.
- Wondering about slope stability. Thinking about the area that was cut along Haisla Boulevard that was recently replanted with the willow stakes to restabilize the soil
 - The Director of Leisure Services advised that the Horticulturist planted willow stakes along the hillside to provide additional slope stabilization. Kitimat receives significant rainfall and the natural low brush vegetation would provide some support. When the willows mature, they will add to the aesthetics of the view and the hillside along Haisla Boulevard.
- Is there a reason to think that cutting down the area of forest on that mountain would be significantly different and would destabilize soil. Why would the soil be less stable there if there weren't trees? Why do we think that the soil would be more stable on this mountain?
 - The Director of Leisure Services advised that he could not answer the question, but they would need to gather the information and review the project.
 - The Director of Engineering advised that there are geotechnical engineers involved in this assessment. The area also has bed rock and there are different characteristics involved in this part of site. Geotechnical engineers will provide recommendations to ensure this does not happen.
- Is the Geotechnical Engineer employed by Sandhill?
 - The Director of Engineering advised a geotechnical engineer is employed by Sandhill but as mentioned there was a third party review done by independent geotechnical engineers hired by the District that reviewed all the reports.
- What would we do with the lumber in that area?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that it would be up to the applicant to determine what would happen with the timber that is ultimately harvested
- Has there been a calculation of how much carbon has been sequestered in that area?
 - The Planning Consultant advised this aspect has not been investigated
- Is that something that would happen?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that he couldn't answer that question. It's a determination if Council wanted to see or if it was felt critical by the District.
- What does clean waste soil mean?
 - The Planning Consultant advised when a site is developed there is overburden on the property that needs to be removed. Ultimately, the developer needs to get rid of it somehow. Overburden is essentially waste soil that is not being used by the development of that particular property.
- What are there any other potential uses for the soil?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that if the developer felt that there was an additional use for it then they would use it. If deposited at Sandhill then Sandhill would store it
- Where exactly would most of the clean soil be coming from?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that it would be coming from within the District of Kitimat
- How do we know that there wouldn't be any contaminants in the soil?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that specifically to that question, the province has legislation that if the soil is from a commercial and/or industrial site and if it exceeds a certain amount and it's determined to have Schedule 2 uses, then testing is

- undertaken by a professional has to occur to ensure the soil is not contaminated before the soil is deposited at the site. Sandhill also recognizes a responsibility on its part from a business case perspective. They recognize that there may be soil deposited from a non-commercial or non-industrial site and it may/may not exceed 30 square metres. Sandhill proposes undertaking soil testing doing on its own before the soil is deposited into the facility.
- Would the results of that testing be available to the public?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that would be up to the proponent.
 - The Director of Engineering advised that the province is developing a database and will be available as they collect the information.
 - On page 18 of the agenda, it does say LNG was connected with the application but when it came back it said it was not the case?
 - The Chief Administrative Officer advised the initial application stated that it would be used to store LNG Canada soil, but LNG Canada is not included in this application
 - Would LNG still be using that area for soil?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that if LNG wanted to they could use that facility much like anyone else could to store their soil
 - If this goes forward, who exactly would financial benefit?
 - The Chief Administrative Officer advised that with the local community, there would be employment. Ultimately it is a business so they would be looking to make a profit with it.
 - Would it be the average citizen of Kitimat or would it be somebody who is already involved in the industry somehow?
 - The Planning Consultant requested clarification of the question – in terms of depositing the soil or benefitting from profit.
 - Benefitting from profit.
 - The Planning Consultant advised again, that is part of the business case of Sandhill's proposal. It would be up to them to determine who is going to benefit from the monies that would be generated.
 - Is there a way to ensure that citizens of Kitimat are the ones that benefit the most?

Councillor Feldhoff requested that Council receive presentation in terms of what people's concerns are.

The Chief Administrative Officer raised the Public Hearing Policy and the limit of five minute per person, open it up to others who want to speak and then give anyone who wishes another opportunity to speak

Councillor Feldhoff noted that it is typically not a question and answer format, you make your presentation with your concerns and comments.

The Mayor asked for the question again.

- How would it be insured that the citizens of Kitimat would benefit?
 - The Chief Administrative Officer advised that it isn't something that we would be able to say for sure. Hopefully locals would have the qualifications and skills necessary to work at the location but ultimately it's Sandhill decision on who would be the best candidates for working at the positions.
- How would this affect the wildlife corridors?
 - The Planning Consultant advised that an environmental assessment has been done and overseen by peer review as well as by Administration.

- Can you tell me more about the recommendations from Fisheries and Oceans on page 44?
 - The Planning Consultant advised those recommendations are much like a riparian assessment. They will have to be implemented or included in an environmental protection plan. A qualified environmental professional would have to ensure the DFO requirements are included in the environmental protection plan, which is ultimately submitted to the District. It would then be overseen by the District Engineer.

The Chief Administrative Officer advised that the visual are located at page 42 of the agenda.

Mayor Germuth called for public input three times. No other public input was offered.

Moved and seconded,

“THAT the Public Hearing for Bylaw No. 2029, 2023 and Bylaw No. 2030, 2023 be closed.”

Motion Carried Unanimously

There being no further comments, the Public Hearing closed at 7:22 p.m.

CERTIFIED TRUE AND CORRECT

Mayor

Corporate Officer