



# Reasons for Decision of the Chief Executive Assessment Officer

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION TO AMEND PRINCE RUPERT  
GAS TRANSMISSION UNDER THE *ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
ACT* (2018)

AUGUST 28, 2025



**EAO**

Environmental  
Assessment Office



## 1.0 CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

Prince Rupert Gas Transmission (PRGT, the Project) is pipeline which is certified to deliver natural gas from the Hudson Hope area in the northeast of British Columbia (B.C.) to either Lelu Island, near Prince Rupert, B.C or the proposed Ksi Lisims LNG Facility on Pearse Island. Construction of PRGT initiated in 2024.

On August 23, 2024, Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Ltd. (PRGT Ltd., the Proponent) submitted the Eastern Route Alternative Amendment Application (Amendment Application) to amend the Environmental Assessment Certificate #E14-06 (the Certificate), proposing a new project initiation point 37 kilometres (km) west of Chetwynd, along with a co-located compressor and meter station. The proposal includes an approximately 172 km alternate pipeline route (Eastern Route Alternative) following the Pine River valley and Highway 97 to Tudyah Lake, rejoining the existing certified route southwest of the town of Mackenzie. If approved and selected by PRGT Ltd for construction, this new route would replace a 223 km portion of the current pipeline, making it 51 km shorter.

The Amendment Application was reviewed by the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) with engagement from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), eight First Nations, and the public. The EAO prepared a report entitled “The EAO’s Assessment of an Application for Certificate Amendment: Amendment #7 – Eastern Route Alternative” (the Report), which summarized the review and issues raised.

I have considered all of the information in the Report, including submissions and correspondence from First Nations and the public, in making my decision. The Report is posted to the EAO’s Project Information Centre (EPIC) [website](#). This decision is made pursuant to Section 32(3) of the *Environmental Assessment Act*, 2018 (the Act), which requires that I, after consideration of an amendment application, either amend the EAC, including the option to vary, remove or attach new conditions, or refuse to amend the EAC.

## 2.0 CONSIDERATIONS

In addition to the factors assessed in the EAO Report and the recommendations provided, I considered whether issues raised by reviewers were appropriately, mitigated, or otherwise accommodated to the extent possible within the EA process or other regulatory processes.

As described in Section 5.0 of the Report, seven key issues and effects, related to the Amendment Application, were identified following completion of review of the Amendment Application: caribou, grizzly bear, freshwater resources, air quality, vegetation, cumulative effects, and effects of PRGT on First Nation rights. The EAO assessed each of these key issues and their effects and considered whether proposing new Certificate conditions or amendments to current Certificate conditions were required to address these concerns. The EAO also considered applicable permits and authorizations (such as those required by B.C. Energy Regulator and Fisheries and Oceans Canada), which addressed concerns related to freshwater resources, air quality and vegetation.

I note that, to address remaining concerns regarding caribou, grizzly bear and cumulative effects, as part of the Amendment, six conditions have been added, including Condition #6 Regional Cumulative Effects Initiatives. In addition, the Amendment requires updates to the Grizzly Bear and Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plans related to the Eastern Route Alternative. The respective Management Plan updates must be developed in consultation with First Nations and relevant agencies, with time allowed for feedback and must be submitted to the EAO for approval prior to construction of the Eastern Route Alternative.

Based on my review of the Amendment Application and the Report, I believe that the Eastern Route Alternative would result in minimal changes to the potential construction and operations-related effects, compared to the currently certified route. In cases where there may be changes in potential effects, these will be addressed through the conditions in the Certificate, amendments to those conditions, additional conditions included in the Amendment, and any applicable permits and authorizations required prior to construction. I have considered the issues that were raised during engagement and feel that these have been addressed.

In addition to the above consideration of addressing key issues, I also considered whether the amendment assessment process included seeking the resolution of issues raised by participating Indigenous nations to the extent possible.

The EAO sought consensus with eight participating Indigenous nations throughout the nine months of the amendment assessment process: Binche Whu'ten, Blueberry River First Nations, Halfway River First Nation, Horse Lake First Nation, McLeod Lake Indian Band, Nak'azdli Whut'en, Sauteau First Nations, West Moberly First Nations.

During the amendment assessment process, the EAO exchanged emails and letters and met with nations to address concerns raised regarding the Amendment Application and/or the draft Report. The Report describes consensus seeking in further detail, the nature of interests and concerns related to the Amendment Application, how they were addressed, and whether they remained unresolved. I note that that Sauteau First Nations provided support for Amendment in consideration of avoidance of key areas of value and avoiding contributions to cumulative impacts.

Though consensus was not reached with all Nations, I note that, where relevant, the EAO has updated or added conditions in response to interests and concerns shared during consensus seeking.

I am satisfied with the level of consultation and engagement that the EAO conducted with participating Indigenous nations, and the efforts made towards seeking consensus.

Aside from the efforts to seek consensus on the resolution of issues raised by participating Indigenous nations, I also considered the whether the EAO's process enabled robust engagement and issues resolution.

I acknowledge the process included a virtual information session for the public, a public comment period, and reviews of materials by the TAC and participating Indigenous nations, which included three opportunities to submit comments or raise concerns during the assessment of the Amendment Application. I note that, due to the number of concerns raised and the complexity of issues identified, engagement occurred over an extended period of approximately nine months, from November 2024 to July 2025. Key issues and concerns related to the Amendment Application are discussed in the Report; matters that are outside the scope of the amendment assessment process were identified for completeness. The TAC, including First Nations, were asked to review the draft Report and provide comments or request edits.

In my view, the EAO provided the time and opportunity for the TAC and participating Indigenous Nations to fully participate in the amendment assessment process. The process and engagement completed by the EAO is sufficient support to my decision on this Amendment Application.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

After considering the Report, the assessment process, input from TAC and participating Indigenous Nations and PRGT Ltd., I have approved Amendment #7 to the Certificate under Section 32 of the Act.



---

Alex MacLennan  
Chief Executive Assessment Officer

Signed this 28 day of August, 2025.