

Rabaska - Comments.

The following comments are made without consulting the EIS, as this is only available in the French language.

I have a Chief Engineer's Certificate, Steam & Motor, unlimited horsepower, and I have been working in shore based employment, since 1973, in various positions as a Marine Superintendent/Surveyor.

A substantial part of my work has been involved in Marine Insurance Claims both as Underwriter's Surveyor, Lloyds of London, and Owner's Representative.

It would appear, at this stage, that any comments by members of the public will be irrelevant as frequent announcements are being made to the commencement of construction work, that is, it is a 'done deal'. The consultation process appears to be a smoke screen to add some legality to the project. This is to be expected when one of the major partners is Gaz de France, which is arrogance personified

1) LNG Tankers, by their design, have large freeboards even in a fully loaded condition. That is, they have a large surface area above the water line which is subject to the effects of the wind. This is critical during berthing/unberthing operations and will require high standards of ship handling to ensure safe berthing/unberthing without contact with the quayside and subsequent damage to tanker/quayside/pipeline. Carrying out these operations in ice conditions will also increase the risk.

It is stated that after berthing that *tugs will remain on stand by*. Will the tugs remain in the vicinity of the vessel or at their base in Quebec City ?

2) The quay is to be constructed in 15 metres of water, at low tide, dredging of the the river bed will not be required.

This will position the quayside closer to the main shipping channel increasing the chance of an accident if a passing vessel loses power/steerage.

The main shipping channel is used by a great variety of commercial vessels including tug/barge operations.

Surely, a LNG Terminal should not be constructed parallel/close the main shipping channel, but, in a remote location, that is, suitable inlet, where it will not be exposed to passing shipping traffic. I believe that there are some 40 LNG Terminals in operation, worldwide, and that their safety record is impeccable.

Are any of these terminals located close to a main shipping channel, or, are they in remote locations ?

3) On the Rabaska web site reference is made to the fact that LNG Tankers are 'double skinned'. The only way such a tanker can be constructed is with a double skin. In other words this is slaver to prove a point that does not exist. The change over to double skin liquid tankers, crude/product, was brought about with the typical American paranoid reaction after the "Exxon Valdez" grounding in Alaska with the ensuing large pollution in pristine waters. Prior to that there had been larger pollution incidents, in equally pristine waters, namely, the "Torrey Canyon", Cornwall, England, and the "Amoco Cadiz", Brittany, France, but these were glossed over.

4) In 1988 I was Superintendent for a crude oil tanker "Czantoria". This tanker, with full cargo of crude oil, hit a concrete caisson at St. Romuald. The tanker was torn open in way of one of it's crude oil cargo tanks and a considerable amount of crude oil was spilled into the river. This was a major pollution incident with ensuing clean up.

If a LNG Tanker is damaged for reasons dealt with in 1) and 2), above, or for any other reason and there is an escape of gas then this would, more than likely, result in a catastrophic explosion.

In any of the surveys has the close proximity of the electrical power lines, transversing the main shipping channel, been taken into consideration ?

R. H. Nocon.