

REPORT OF THE NLNG*Six* ESHA WORKSHOP WITH STAKEHOLDERS, HELD AT THE PRESIDENTIAL HOTEL PORT HARCOURT ON THE 11TH OF AUGUST 2003

Attendance

In attendance were representatives of:

1. Federal Ministry of Environment (FMEnv)
2. Rivers State Ministry of Environment (RSMEnv)
3. Bonny Kingdom Development Council (BKDC)
4. Bonny Environmental Consultants Committee (BECC)
5. Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)
6. Bonny Council of Chiefs (BCC),
7. NLNG Community Relations
8. Ecosphere – Environmental and Social Consultants
9. Babsal – Health Consultant
10. Bonny youth Federation, Bonny
11. Finima representatives
12. Niger Delta Wetland Centre representatives (NDWC).

Opening/Commencement

The workshop, which was planned to start by 10a.m., started much later due to technical difficulties.

Introductory Statement by the NLNG Community Relations Manager

The NLNG Community Relations Manager, Mr. Sebastian Oyegun formally welcomed the attendees and went ahead to explain the purpose of the workshop. He urged the stakeholders to critically appraise the work that was to be presented by the Consultants and also make their input to enable NLNG come up with appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts identified in connection with NLNG*Six*. The consultants thereafter made their presentations.

Presentations

Work accomplished so far

Professor Odu, speaking on behalf of the consultants, stated that the consultants have reviewed the current state of the receiving environment (i.e. baseline conditions for NLNG*Plus* as well as outcomes of limited data gathering exercise for train six).

He further stated that with regard to the Construction Phase for train six, the following actions were accomplished:

- Review of current information on Hazards
- Identification and discussion of all interactions

- Insertion of identified impacts into impacts table
- Determination of the likelihood and consequence of each impact
- Allocation of overall rating to each impact

Similarly, for the Operations Phase, the following actions were undertaken:

- Review of current information on Hazards
- Identification of impacts for the Operations Phase of NLNG*Six*, additional to those identified in the interaction matrix for Operations (NLNG*Plus*)
- Inclusion of all those impacts to be reconsidered
- Insertion of identified impacts into impacts table for Operations

Furthermore, the following actions were taken:

- Allocation of four (4) different symbols to all interactions in the interaction matrix: (a) those identified in *Plus*; (b) those identified and mitigated in *Plus*; (c) those identified in *Plus* but reconsidered for *Six*, and (d) new impacts for *Six*.
- Rating if all identified impacts and entry of all descriptions and qualifications for each impact into the impacts table.
- Production of coded matrix of all interactions (*Plus* and *Six*) (Construction and Operations)
- Production of draft impact table for NLNG*Six* (reconsidered and new impacts only (Construction and Operations) (for presentation and discussion in the workshop)
- Production of draft mitigation tables for NLNG*Six* (reconsidered and new impacts only (Construction and Operations) (also for presentation and discussion in the workshop)

After the presentation, Professor Odu invited Dr. V. C. Obinna and Professor Alo to present the impacts table.

Presentation of the Impacts Table

Dr. V. C. Obinna presented the impacts table which comprised thirteen (13) Construction and eight (8) Operations impacts. After Dr. Obinna's presentation, Professor Alo, who applauded Dr. Obinna's presentation, threw more light on health-related impacts. The attendees then had a coffee break.

Presentation of Mitigation Tables and Statements by BECC Chairman and Others

As soon as Dr. Obinna was called upon to present the mitigation table, the Chairman of BECC, Mr. Joshua Pepple, asked to be allowed to speak.

Statement of Chairman of BECC

Mr. Joshua Pepple stated that NLNG has not been fulfilling their promises to the community from the time of the base plant to the *Plus* project. He also blamed the Federal Ministry of Environment (FMEnv) for not monitoring the

implementation of mitigation measures. He then announced that the community was walking out of the workshop.

Response by Dr. Adefemi of FMEnv.

In response, Dr Adefemi of FMEnv stated that the ministry had always interacted with BKDC and had had workshops with them in which implementation measures were fully discussed. He, however, pointed out, among others that the cause of the problem was that stakeholders were not involved in the scoping exercise for NLNGSix.

Statement by Chief Edward Bristow

Chief Bristow demonstrated knowledge of the EIA process and cited examples of his involvement in EIAs carried out in Portugal and elsewhere. He stressed the importance of consultation with NGOs and also noted that SPDC, was in the process of carrying out a world class EIA. He advised NLNG to emulate SPDC, pointing out that “it was the right way forward.”

Statement by BKDC’s Secretary

The secretary of BKDC commented that Jane Emereuem ought to have presented the impacts and mitigation tables to them the day she met with BKDC; that would have enabled them to peruse the document prior to discussion.

Appeal from Professor Amachree

Professor Amachree, representing an NGO, appealed to the people to “give the meeting a chance” He further advised Bonny people to speak their minds and then appealed to Chiefs Longjohn and Bristow to allow the meeting to go on.

The NLNG Community Relations Manager’s Statement

The CR manager tried to pacify the stakeholders who were already at the door being led by Dr. Longjohn in a walkout. He said, “we may be slow, but we have a structured way of implementation.” He then appealed to the Bonny people to allow the meeting to continue while putting their grievances on the table.

Chief Longjohn’s Statement

Chief Longjohn, one of the prominent chiefs of Bonny insisted that mitigations from the previous trains had not been implemented. He lamented the change by Government in the nomenclature of the company from Finima LNG to Bonny LNG and now to Nigeria LNG. He regretted that although there are four companies in Bonny, the people are still suffering. He said that Chiefs are doing their best to restrain the restive youths and appealed to Nigerians to come to the aid of Bonny.

Mr. Oyegun’s Speech and the Walk-out

Mr. Oyegun, the CR manager in an attempt to salvage the situation requested that the workshop be turned to a scoping workshop. However, by that time the people of Bonny and Finima were no longer interested and duly walked out.

Presentation of the Mitigation Plan

Following the walkout by the community representatives, Dr. V.C. Obinna was asked to present the mitigation plan to the remaining attendees. He did so and many comments followed the presentation.

Comments by Remaining Attendees

Peter Aluko (SPDC)

Asked if BECC was consulted before the whole exercise.

Response: Responding on behalf of the Social group, Ms. Jane Emeruem informed the house that two appointments made by NLNG's Community Relations (CR) for the group to meet with BECC failed. Plans are still under way to meet with BECC.

Chief Idomiye-Obu (Representative of one of the NGOs)

- Talked about monitoring. He suggested that:
 - the Bonny community should set up its own committee of experts to carryout monitoring
 - FMEnv and RSMEnv Should help in monitoring
 - Socio-economic promises should be followed up

Dr. Adefemi (Federal Ministry of Environment)

- Scoping was not carried out with stakeholders – that was the cause of the walk-out

Questions on C.1 What is the size of the sterile zone? What is happening their now?

Questions on C.4 “You have a fish catch study.” What are the deductions? Has this been discussed with the stakeholders? FMEnv, had in a meeting on this, previously recommended that a meeting should be organised. This has been an issue since the base project.

With regard to settlements and waste generated, the view of the FMENV was that the impact was a major one, not moderate. According to them, the settlements were aesthetically unacceptable. FMENV had argued in the past that the settlements should be removed. This was to have been done after the base project yet this is train six and they are still there. The settlements should be removed, he concluded.

On impact C.8, he argued that “waste generated will increase; the effects will be cumulative.”

Questions on O.6 Various Emissions. They stated that what is indicated on paper is that this “activity is pending.” Where are the figures from base project onwards, he

queried. “What are the emissions now?” “They should be modelled and presented in this EIA”.

Prof. Odu’s Response

- More detailed information awaited re: air modelling
- Fish catch study discussed with BKDC. NLNG has started purchase of boat engines.
- Landtake for train 6 is within the NLNG Area. Only a very small additional area in the lay-down area will be required.

Prof. Amachree (Friends of the Earth)

- C.2 Referred to different perceptions of people re: Finima issues. He talked about
- Need for a Third Party to represent in discussions between NLNG and the Finima people, especially NGOs.
 - This should be included in the mitigation measures
 - Internationally, he said, people make sure that NGOs join such discussions.

Question on C.4 “The exclusion zone” – how big is it? He felt that the area of the exclusion zone should be stated.

C.6 On Settler Villages he felt that the impact should be major

C.7 With reference to this impact, he commented that anything that affects fishing should be a major impact.

Question on C.8 “Generation of sewage ...” “What will it be?” Figures should be supplied as to the level of generation. The word cumulative, was used, they pointed out “so what are the figures now?”

On increased movement of NLNG ships together with other craft, he felt that the impact should be “major.”

Prof. Odu pointed out that the rating of impacts takes into account likelihood and consequence with clearly defined terms each for the Environment, Social and Health sectors i.e. they were objective rather than the subjective rating Prof. Amachree has in mind. That in the full EIA these terms will be there and Prof. Amachree and others will be able to better appreciate the ratings of impacts.

C. Imabo (Rivers State Ministry of Environment)

Stated as follows

- What happened could have been avoided by scoping.
- EIA process is new in Nigeria, we are learning
- Adequate consultation is still lacking. If people affected are not carried along from the beginning, problems arise.
- In this case adequate consultation was not made
- Need to still get the input of Bonny people into the process.

Question on O.6 Various emissions – “acid gas incinerator.” What does it mean?

Question on O.7 The activities of these trains and noise generated impact on wildlife. During the 6th train there will be additional impacts. We want to conserve some species. Operational noise and traffic noise could have additional impact on wildlife why then “no effect?”

Prof. Odu’s Response

- NLNG team and the team from the Hague went to Abuja and discussed the project. Based on the agreement at Abuja, the process started.
- This is an addendum to *Plus*, not a full-blown EIA.
- There was a visit to the Bonny Council of Chiefs and they were duly informed about train 6.
- The EIA has to be done within a very short time, hence the apparent hurry.

Mr. Oladipo (FMENV Abuja)

- NLNG made presentation at Abuja
- They sought approval to use data in the 4th and 5th train for the 6th
- They were interested in dredging issues of the channel
- Did not consider scoping issues in that meeting
- They said that additional information will be needed about
 - Noise
 - Temperature
 - Nature Park

C.6 Re-examine the rating of impacts

C.11 and C.12 are not construction activities. Should be tied to activities relating to decommissioning and abandonment.

Mr. Kamalu (FMENV)

Question on C.2 “stakeholders” – Consultants should confirm this issue of BKDC and Finima Development Committee (FDC). “Does BKDC incorporate FDC?”

The issue of BECC – “What role do they play in the overall environmental issue in Bonny?”

C.9 “Lack of nutrition in the available food will lead to malnutrition....” What is the meaning of “managed for continuous improvement”

O.2 ‘NLNG emergency response plan’. “Do we have such an existing plan? If so bring it to FMENV for ratification.”

O.7 Operational noise and traffic noise – re wildlife. “No mitigation required.” “Is that true?” “Can’t something be done to reduce noise?”

Prof Odu’s Response

- Noise contours that can affect wildlife don’t go beyond the sterile zone.

Engineer Gomwalk (FMEnv)

O.7 The issue of reversibility and irreversibility. Re-assess the impact.

Harry O.E. (Ministry of Environment, Rivers State)

C.7 Fishery activities, forestry depletion, etc. Impact – “moderate.” “What is the sustainable usage of the forest?” NLNG should do something about that, not just “sustainable usage.” Refer to specific issues e.g. fisheries, “what will NLNG do about this?”

O.2 Ballast water. “Moderate Impact.” Increased number of ships – with 4 and 5 and then 6. Frequency will increase.

Activities of those next door. There are plans to put a second train. Frequency of ships will increase.

Perception of stakeholders - very worried about it. “Are the ships allowed to discharge in inland waterways?” If the regulation does not allow them to discharge, then there is no problem. But they are discharging!

Closing

After the foregoing comments, there was lunch. This marked the end of the workshop.