



Government  
of Canada

Gouvernement  
du Canada

2014-2015 Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under  
Section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*

Canada 

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of the Environment, 2015.

This publication may be reproduced for personal or internal use without permission, provided the source is fully acknowledged. However, multiple copy reproduction of this publication in whole or in part for purposes of redistribution requires the prior written permission from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3, or [info@ceaa-acee.gc.ca](mailto:info@ceaa-acee.gc.ca)

Catalogue No.: En104-13E-PDF  
ISSN: 2292-2385

This document is issued in French under the title: Rapport des autorités fédérales ayant des obligations au titre de l'article 71 de la Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale (2012) pour l'année 2014-2015

Alternative formats may be requested by contacting: [info@ceaa-acee.gc.ca](mailto:info@ceaa-acee.gc.ca)

## Foreword

I am pleased to table the attached report entitled “Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under Section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*” (CEAA 2012). This consolidated report is being tabled on behalf of federal authorities to ensure that Parliament receives information on activities on federal lands and outside Canada in a timely, efficient and transparent manner. Federal authorities must table an annual report in Parliament in order to meet their section 71 obligation under CEAA 2012. The federal authorities that have included their reports in this consolidated report satisfy this obligation. Other federal authorities who have an existing mechanism for reporting to Parliament typically, an annual report, should have satisfied this obligation through that mechanism. This is the third consolidated report tabled in Parliament since the implementation of CEAA 2012; my first as Minister of Environment and Climate Change Canada.

CEAA 2012 is focused on environmental assessments of designated projects conducted by one of three responsible authorities (the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, the National Energy Board or the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency). CEAA 2012 also includes provisions to ensure that projects on federal lands and outside Canada are considered in a careful and precautionary manner. Sections 66-72 of CEAA 2012 require authorities to determine the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects that might result from a project being carried out on federal lands or outside Canada. Authorities must make this determination prior to making a decision in relation to a project that would enable the project to proceed in whole or in part. If an authority concludes that a project is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, the authority may refer the project to the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council will determine whether the significant adverse environmental effects are justified in the circumstances.

CEAA 2012 does not specify how authorities are to conduct their analysis for determining significant adverse environmental effects. An evaluation tool was developed by authorities, with support from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, setting out a framework for a consistent approach and facilitating the joint analysis of projects involving multiple authorities. However, authorities have full discretion in defining the process by which they conduct their analysis, and the breadth of their selected governance activities are reflected in the enclosed reports.

Section 71 reports have been provided by federal authorities to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency for consolidation. Please contact the appropriate federal authority if you have questions with respect to the information provided in these reports.



## Table of Contents

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada .....	1
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada .....	1
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency .....	2
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited .....	2
Belledune Port Authority .....	3
Business Development Bank of Canada .....	4
Canada Border Services Agency .....	5
Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions .....	6
Canadian Food Inspection Agency .....	7
Canadian Heritage .....	7
Canadian Institute of Health Research .....	8
Canadian Space Agency .....	8
Canadian Tourism Commission .....	9
Copyright Board of Canada .....	9
Correctional Service Canada .....	10
Department of National Defence .....	10
Employment and Social Development Canada .....	11
Environment Canada .....	12
Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario .....	12
Fisheries and Oceans Canada .....	13
Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development .....	14
Halifax Port Authority .....	14
Hamilton Port Authority .....	15
Health Canada .....	16
Industry Canada .....	16
Infrastructure Canada .....	17
Marine Atlantic Inc. ....	17
Montreal Port Authority .....	18
Nanaimo Port Authority .....	18
National Research Council .....	19
Natural Resources Canada .....	19

Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada .....	20
Oshawa Port Authority .....	20
Parks Canada Agency .....	21
Port Alberni Port Authority .....	21
Prince Rupert Port Authority .....	22
Public Health Agency of Canada .....	22
Public Works and Government Services Canada .....	23
Québec Port Authority .....	24
Registry of the Competition Tribunal.....	25
Royal Canadian Mounted Police .....	25
Saguenay Port Authority .....	26
Sept-Îles Port Authority .....	26
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.....	27
St. John's Port Authority .....	28
Standards Council of Canada .....	28
Statistics Canada .....	29
Thunder Bay Port Authority.....	29
Transport Canada.....	30
Trois-Rivières Port Authority.....	31
Vancouver Fraser Port Authority .....	32
Western Economic Diversification Canada .....	33
Windsor Port Authority.....	33

## **Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada**

Pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) reviews projects and considers their environmental effects including effects on Aboriginal peoples, prior to issuance of a permit, lease, licence or other authorizations.

For projects south of 60° on-reserve, the AANDC Environmental Review Process (the Process) consists of a suite of policy tools informed by the perspectives of various stakeholders, including First Nations and industry representatives. In the few cases where CEAA 2012 applies in the North (areas within Nunavut, but excluded from the Nunavut Settlement Area, and the Inuvialuit Settlement Region of the Northwest Territories), AANDC reviews each project on a case-by-case basis to determine if there are any adverse environmental impacts or impacts to Aboriginal peoples as per Section 5 (1)(c) of CEAA 2012.

The Process ensures that projects receive a risk assessment and scrutiny commensurate to the level of risk and the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects associated with carrying out the project. For the fiscal year 2014-2015, the Department determined that none of the projects it reviewed were likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. No referral to Governor in Council was required.

For further information on the process, please visit the website: [www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1345141628060/1345141658639](http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1345141628060/1345141658639)

## **Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada**

In response to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) coming into force, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) developed and implemented a risk-based approach to the environmental evaluation of departmental activities to facilitate compliance with sections 67-69. The approach is based on guidance provided by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and ensures consistency in the application of CEAA 2012 to departmental activities, and that environmental risks are assessed for all projects on federal lands.

AAFC categorizes projects into those having low, moderate or high environmental risk. Departmental officials make the determination on the potential for significant adverse environmental effects for individual projects, and incorporate mitigation measures as appropriate to minimize environmental impacts.

Between April 1, 2014 and March 31st, 2015, AAFC determined that no project was likely to have significant adverse environmental effects and did not refer any projects to the Governor in Council.

## **Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency**

ACOA has implemented a thorough approach to evaluating environmental impacts under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

ACOA assesses each project to ensure compliance with the CEAA 2012. An analysis of all potential environmental effects of a project on federal lands is completed and a determination is made before a project is approved for funding.

ACOA has a contract with Public Works and Government Services Canada to conduct environmental effects analyses under section 67 of the CEAA 2012. Public Works provides ACOA with the expertise and guidance that allows it to make an informed determination.

To date, all projects on federal lands that have received a contribution from ACOA were determined not likely to have a significant adverse environmental effect.

Further information on ACOA's projects can be found at [www.acoa-apec.gc.ca](http://www.acoa-apec.gc.ca).

## **Atomic Energy of Canada Limited**

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) serves Canada as a responsible steward of the environment. AECL is committed to assess the impacts of all of our activities on the environment through rigorous internal processes. Canadian Nuclear Laboratories Ltd. (CNL) operates facilities on behalf of AECL. Many of these facilities are licensed by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC), and as such, the CNSC's regulatory requirements must be met. CNL has implemented a risk based approach to address the requirements of Sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*.

Environmental Reviews for low risk projects where conventional mitigation measures can be applied undergo a streamlined review. Reviews for moderate risk projects where there is greater potential for impacts on environment or humans undergo a more rigorous review. Criteria used to distinguish moderate risk projects include the size of the building footprint, potential for airborne or liquid effluents, potential for effects on species at risk and potential for public concern.

In fiscal year 2014-2015, no projects were determined to likely have significantly adverse environmental effects. Additional information on environmental performance at AECL sites (operated by Canadian Nuclear Laboratories) is provided on the website [www.cnl.ca](http://www.cnl.ca).



## **Belledune Port Authority**

The Belledune Port Authority is committed to ensuring that the Port and its clients do not impact negatively on the environment. The Port has developed effective environmental management systems based on sound principles and measures.

The Port and its tenants adhere to the requirements of numerous acts and regulations including the *Canada Marine Act*, the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Canadian Shipping Act, 2001* and the *Fisheries Act*, among others.

Projects undertaken by the Port, its clients or its tenants within the jurisdictional area of the Belledune Port Authority undergo environmental reviews by experts to determine potential adverse environmental effects to air, land and water and to identify methods of mitigation if necessary. These assessments, in addition to review and continual improvement of policies and legislation, ensure the Belledune Port Authority meets its environmental responsibilities. There are no projects to report for fiscal year 2014.

Additional information is available at the Port of Belledune's website:

<http://www.portofbelledune.ca/index.php>

## **Business Development Bank of Canada**

Given its mandate to support entrepreneurs, and recognizing that most businesses entail some degree of environmental risk, BDC has a rigorous governance structure in place.

BDC's governance structure comprises a Board approved Policy on the Environment. Emanating from this policy are detailed procedures, business rules, processes, and tools that ensure that these principles and objectives are achieved. BDC's Policy, business rules, processes and procedures are subject to regular review to ensure consistency with evolving legislation and best practices. Compliance is monitored as part of BDC's Quality Review and Internal Audit processes.

Funding of certain projects subject to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* and listed in BDC Procedures can only be approved upon receipt of an assessment confirming that the project is unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. Internal assessments and site visits are also conducted to identify and classify possible environmental liabilities and environmental effects associated with a property's past and present use. BDC makes use of third party environmental consultants in cases where an internal assessment is deemed insufficient, inconclusive or where serious concerns are identified.

Projects undertaken on Federal Lands and in jurisdictions outside Canada are subject to the same principles and activities outlined above. To the best of its knowledge, BDC attests that it has not, including in the past fiscal year ended March 31, 2015, financed any projects that could have significant adverse environmental effects.

## Canada Border Services Agency

The CBSA is committed to the protection of the environment and as such conducts its operations and activities in an environmentally responsible and sustainable manner.

Under section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, the CBSA is required to conduct a determination of the significance of adverse environmental effects of its projects. CBSA maintains an internal environmental assessment process to meet this requirement.

The process, which has been integrated with the CBSA Real Property Investment Board, is a risk-based approach that considers scope and complexity of proposed projects to ensure that careful assessments are conducted and any potential environmental effects are considered.

The approach consists of an Environmental Effects Checklist, a screening tool that evaluates proposed projects to ensure their environmental effects are assessed. If the screening checklist identifies sensitive environmental receptors, or the scope of the project is of a magnitude such that there is a greater potential for environmental effects, a more detailed evaluation is required.

All assessments are reviewed internally by the CBSA Infrastructure and Environmental Operations Directorate, and the CBSA maintains an inventory of all the assessments, including records of decision.

In 2014-15, assessed projects were determined to be unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

## Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions

Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions (CED) assesses all projects carried out on federal lands to determine the environmental effects, and to ensure compliance with sections 67 to 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) before approving a financial contribution. Generally, the projects funded by CED do not have an environmental impact.

During the year 2014-2015, four (4) active projects on federal lands were evaluated and had no significant non-desirable environmental impact.

CED ensures that the governance mechanism established to enforce CEAA 2012, including projects on federal lands, is consistent with the approach and interpretations of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. The recommended approach examines each project to ensure its conformity with that law. CED has produced a Program Management Manual that provides guidelines to staff to ensure a consistent and a comprehensive approach to environmental assessments under sections 67 to 69 of CEAA 2012.

CED has established a contract with Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) to conduct environmental impact assessments - under section 67 of CEAA 2012 - for all projects covered by the law, including those on federal lands where possible negative environmental effects were previously identified by CED. Assessments conducted by PWGSC allow CED to ensure that projects comply with CEAA 2012. When required, PWGSC also supports CED in evaluating mitigation measures to validate environmental monitoring and to answer any other questions relating to the application of CEAA 2012.

## **Canadian Food Inspection Agency**

The CFIA developed a comprehensive guideline on environmental effects evaluations to facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. The guideline provides the necessary tools and details the process for decision-makers to effectively include considerations of environmental risk and appropriate mitigation measures into real property projects. The guideline ensures that environmental effects are considered when project decisions are made.

By adopting a risk-based approach, a determination is made as to whether projects have low, moderate or high environmental risk. CFIA decision-makers are able to implement appropriate mitigation measures for projects of varying risks. Once the risk level is defined, the guideline specifies the next steps for projects that require an environmental effects evaluation to determine the potential for significant adverse effects.

In 2014-15, assessed projects were determined to be unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. No referral to Governor in Council was required.

## **Canadian Heritage**

In response to its obligations outlined in the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), Canadian Heritage (PCH) has developed and implemented a risk-based approach to evaluate the environmental effects of its activities and funded projects. The approach is based on guidance provided by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and ensures consistency in the application of CEAA 2012 for all projects on federal lands.

Departmental officials make the determination on the potential for significant adverse environmental effects of proposed projects that fall under the definition of a project under CEAA 2012 and incorporate mitigation measures as appropriate to minimize environmental impacts. In most cases, these are considered to be small projects and are unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. Such projects could include the erection of a monument, the construction, renovation or expansion of sporting facilities, schools or cultural buildings. Determinations made in 2014-2015, with regard to environmental effects, indicated that no PCH projects were likely to have significant adverse environmental effects and as such, the Department did not refer any projects to the Governor in Council.

## **Canadian Institute of Health Research**

The Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR) has determined there is minimal risk that the organization will carry out or financially support projects that fall under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). Given that CIHR is a federal health research funding agency and does not conduct its own research, projects falling under the Act would be research proposals submitted to CIHR for funding.

CIHR has made compliance with CEAA 2012 a requirement for obtaining agency funding. As such, it has implemented a mandatory field within its research funding application forms whereby research proposals that potentially fall under CEAA 2012 are identified and flagged in CIHR's database at the application intake stage. Should the research proposal be successful, CIHR then follows up with the applicant to obtain the information necessary to make a determination following the guidelines and criteria set out in *Projects on Federal Lands: Making a determination under section 67 of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. Database controls are in place to ensure that no federal funds are released until CIHR is fully satisfied that the project is unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects on federal lands or outside Canada. This process is actively monitored for continuous improvement.

In fiscal year 2014-2015, CIHR did not support projects that fell under sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012.

## **Canadian Space Agency**

To fulfill its obligations under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, the Canadian Space Agency determines the environmental impacts of projects on federal lands by using a process that provides an analysis of potential significant adverse environmental effects resulting from the projects funded, or implemented by the Canadian Space Agency.

The process enhances operational effectiveness and strengthens departmental accountability and governance with the implementation of procedural requirements to determine whether significant adverse environmental effects will be caused using a process described in guidelines.

The environmental impact of projects is assessed prior to making a decision on their implementation. Measures to mitigate the environmental impacts are included in the authority documents allowing the project to proceed. For fiscal year 2014-2015, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Canadian Tourism Commission**

Destination Canada, the operating name for the Canadian Tourism Commission, is Canada's national tourism marketing organization. We work in partnership with our tourism industry in 12 countries around the world to promote Canada as a premier travel and meetings destination.

To facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA, 2012), Destination Canada uses an established process to determine the adverse environmental effects resulting from any projects it undertakes on federal lands or outside Canada.

In accordance with section 71 of CEAA, 2012, Destination Canada has determined that, for the 2014-2015 fiscal year, it did not undertake any projects on federal lands or outside Canada which were likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Copyright Board of Canada**

The Copyright Board of Canada is a quasi-judicial tribunal that establishes royalties to be paid for the use of copyrighted works. As part of this mandate, the Board does not initiate or participate in any physical activity that is carried out on federal lands or outside Canada in relation to a physical work.

Consequently, for fiscal year 2014-15, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Correctional Service Canada**

Correctional Service Canada (CSC) uses a risk-based approach to comply with its legislative requirements of sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. CSC's approach, which is governed by an internal directive, involves screening proposed projects using an internal checklist to separate projects that require further investigation from routine low-risk projects whose environmental effects are known and can be easily controlled with standard mitigation measures. Projects that require further investigation undergo an Environmental Effects Evaluation, which systematically evaluates and documents the anticipated environmental effects of a proposed project and determines the need to modify the project plan or recommend further mitigation measures to eliminate or minimize the adverse environmental effects.

In fiscal year 2014-2015 CSC did not conduct any projects that were found to have significant adverse environmental effects nor were any projects referred to the Governor in Council for a determination on the justification of effects.

More information about CSC's comprehensive approach to assessing potential environmental impacts of projects is outlined in the Internal Service Directive 318-11 – Environmental Assessment of Projects which can be found at <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/318-11-isd-eng.shtml>.

## **Department of National Defence**

Under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), the Department of National Defence (DND) is required to conduct a determination of the significance of adverse environmental effects associated with planned projects on federal lands and outside of Canada. For fiscal year 2014-2015, all DND projects requiring a determination of significance were evaluated to confirm that adverse environmental effects were unlikely. There was no referral to Governor in Council.

DND continues to renew its departmental direction and guidance, including its Environmental Assessment Manual and its Directive and Order on Environmental Assessment, to better align with CEAA 2012 requirements. In the interim, existing DND policy instruments, which were developed under the former *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, continue to ensure that DND complies with CEAA 2012.



## **Employment and Social Development Canada**

Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) funding does not typically support large scale economic capital ventures that are likely to create environmental impacts. Examples of projects ESDC typically support include:

- Employment recruitment, training and placement for targeted client groups.
- Small scale renovations (i.e. building wheelchair accessible ramps for a First Nation band office).
- Full building renovations (homelessness projects).
- Smaller scale new building construction – typically one or two story buildings for homeless shelters.

In order to facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012, ESDC ensures that:

- projects are tracked through ESDC's Common System for Grants and Contributions (CSGC); and
- when a project has been identified, it is assessed to determine whether it will likely cause significant adverse environmental effects. This assessment is conducted through a series of questions and guidance provided in the CSGC as well as the Department's Operational Guide. The assessment must be completed before a funding decision is made.

The projects that were assessed this past fiscal year did not cause significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Environment Canada**

Environment Canada business is to protect the environment, conserve the country's natural heritage, and provide weather and meteorological information to keep Canadians informed and safe.

Pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, (CEAA 2012) Environment Canada has implemented a rigorous approach for reviewing projects and considering their potential for significant adverse environmental effects prior to carrying out a project, or issuing a grant or permit. Based on guidance provided by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Environment Canada reviews each proposed project on a case-by-case basis to determine if there are any adverse environmental impacts. Policy, guidance documents and reporting tools support implementation of these environmental reviews, and a tracking system is used to record project data and decisions. Ongoing training and communications ensure effective and consistent application of this process, which is actively monitored for continuous improvement.

This is Environment Canada's third report tabled in Parliament for activities on federal lands and outside of Canada in accordance with section 71 of the CEAA 2012. For fiscal year 2014-2015, the Department reviewed approximately 50 projects, and determined that none of these were likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, or were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with the application of appropriate environmental mitigation.

## **Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario**

The Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario (FedDev Ontario) assesses all projects on federal lands for environmental effects to ensure compliance with sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012 before approving a funding contribution. Direct recipients of FedDev Ontario funding that have third-party funding agreements are required to submit any projects on federal lands to FedDev Ontario for determination under CEAA 2012 before finalizing a funding contribution with the third party.

FedDev Ontario established a contract with Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) to conduct environmental effects evaluations under section 67 of CEAA 2012 for all projects on federal lands involving a physical activity in relation to a physical work. These assessments inform FedDev Ontario's determinations under CEAA 2012. Where required, mitigation measures are included in contribution agreements with recipients.

For fiscal year 2014-2015, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Fisheries and Oceans Canada**

Fisheries and Oceans Canada has developed internal operational guidance that outlines an overarching risk-based approach for the assessment and reporting of environmental effects of projects proposed on federal lands that are subject to Section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

For the past year, staff have reviewed and completed Project Effects Determination Reports for projects subject to Section 67. The Reports are a means to record the predicted environmental effects and the proposed mitigation measures that are applied to minimize the potential negative environmental effects of medium- to high-risk projects on federal lands.

The Department's Fisheries Protection Program owns and manages a national database that is used for collecting information on various program activities. This system, called the Program Activity Tracking for Habitat – PATH, has been made available to all programs in the Department who have responsibilities under CEAA 2012. PATH can be used to obtain statistical reports for projects that the department has evaluated under Section 67 of CEAA 2012.

In the last year, there have been no determinations made where a project on federal lands was likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

## Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development

Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD) supports a broad range of international projects including, but not limited to, international development assistance program funding, the Global Peace and Security Fund (including Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force), the Canada Fund for Local Initiatives and the International Science & Technology Partnerships Program.

DFATD has designed and implemented streamlined environmental review processes that demonstrate due diligence in decision-making under sections 67-70 of CEAA 2012 and support the Department's mandate, including Canada's reputation abroad for projects it funds or undertakes. Environmental reviews required for projects outside Canada respect foreign sovereignty, international law, and international agreements to which Canada is party.

The processes articulate roles and responsibilities to emphasize accountability within the Department for ensuring environmental reviews are conducted as appropriate and that decisions are documented and results are reported. Tailored processes have been implemented for specific DFATD programs such as international development assistance. The level of effort and analysis undertaken corresponds with the level of anticipated environmental effects or risks of the proposed project. No project environmental reviews conducted during the 2014-2015 fiscal year resulted in the potential for significant adverse environmental effects. Further information can be found on DFATD's [Sustainable Development](#) website.

## Halifax Port Authority

The Halifax Port Authority is required by Section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) to determine whether projects on federal lands are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. This obligation applies when a Federal Authority proposes to carry out a project or before it exercises a power or performs a duty or function that could permit the project to proceed.

The Halifax Port Authority has developed a CEAA Environmental Form to provide potential proponents with a user friendly process which will meet the intent of CEAA 2012 for proposed projects on Halifax Port Authority Property. Federal department coordination and consultation with the subject matter experts at the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Transport Canada, and the Department of National Defence also factors within the determination process.

The Halifax Port Authority carried out a small number of environmental effects determinations within the specified time period. Projects reviewed within the timeframe were determined not to have significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Hamilton Port Authority**

The Hamilton Port Authority (HPA) manages property comprised of federal lands and lands held in HPA's name along the shores of Hamilton Harbour in Lake Ontario. As a responsible steward of the lands in its care, HPA conducts environmental effects evaluations and determinations for both its own projects and those proposed by prospective tenants.

HPA conducts in-house environmental effects evaluations for routine construction projects that are not likely to result in significant environmental effects with the use of standard mitigation measures. Evaluations of projects involving an industrial or manufacturing process are conducted by qualified consultants, with the input of the appropriate authorities as required.

No projects were determined to have the potential for significant adverse environmental effects within the Hamilton Port Authority's fiscal year, ending December 2014.

## **Health Canada**

Health Canada continues to ensure that it is meeting its obligations under Section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* for activities related to real property on federal lands.

An internal procedure has been implemented that outlines the approach that project managers are to take in determining a project's likelihood to cause significant adverse environmental effects and in identifying proper mitigation measures. The procedure also identifies roles and responsibilities of the relevant parties.

Health Canada determined that there were no projects likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

## **Industry Canada**

To fulfill its obligations under sections 67 - 69 of CEAA 2012, Industry Canada determines the environmental impacts of projects on federal lands by using a process that provides an analysis of potential significant adverse environmental effects resulting from the projects funded, or implemented by, Industry Canada.

The process enhances operational effectiveness and strengthens departmental accountability and governance with the implementation of procedural requirements to determine whether significant adverse environmental effects will be caused using a process described in guidelines.

The environmental impact of projects is assessed prior to making a decision on their implementation. Measures to mitigate the environmental impacts are included in the authority documents allowing the project to proceed. For fiscal year 2014-2015, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Infrastructure Canada**

During the 2014/2015 fiscal year, an internal environmental determination process continued to be carried out on infrastructure projects submitted for federal funding approval. This process is used to identify a project's legislative CEAA 2012 requirements and to ensure that these requirements are fulfilled prior to flowing federal funds.

With respect to fulfilling section 67 requirements, the process involves the following activities:

- Reviewing, analyzing and synthesizing information provided by funding applicants to verify whether CEAA 2012 applies to each prospective project.
- Determining, based on research conducted and on information provided, whether a project is proposed, in whole or in part, on federal lands.
- Informing the appropriate federal authority if a project is found to be proposed, in whole or in part, on federal lands.
- If required, verifying that control mechanisms are in place, such as including requirements in the contribution agreement, to ensure the completion of the Environmental Effects Evaluation (EEE) and that all conditions specified in the EEE, were implemented.
- Over the course of the 2014/15 fiscal year, INFC refined tools used to evaluate prospective projects (i.e. Proponent's EA Questionnaire in the Application Guide) and its internal process based on experience gained during the project evaluation process.

## **Marine Atlantic Inc.**

Marine Atlantic underwent a number of activities during the fiscal year 2014/15 in order to make determinations under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. Such activities included water intrusion assessment and PCB sampling at the Bar Harbour site.

Projects reviewed by Marine Atlantic in the last fiscal year included:

- Argentia Dolphin/Catwalks, NL
- North Sydney Terminal Building, NS
- Port aux Basques Terminal Building upgrades, NL
- Port aux Basques Storm Sewer Rehabilitation, NL

None of the projects that were reviewed were determined to have significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Montreal Port Authority**

The Montreal Port Authority (MPA)'s environmental management system ensures compliance with the requirements of sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012. Indeed, procedures have been developed to ensure that issues, regulatory requirements and environmental aspects are taken into account as part of the management of contracts and leases signed with tenants, and also where work is executed by tenants.

In addition, there is a similar procedure for all projects executed by the MPA. These procedures ensure that environmental effects are assessed for any project or work executed on Port of Montreal's territory.

For all the projects analyzed by the MPA during the period, none were to cause significant adverse environmental effects. The review of these projects has shown that environmental effects could be managed through well-established and effective mitigation measures.

## **Nanaimo Port Authority**

The Nanaimo Port Authority uses an environmental management approach for review of projects on federal lands under its administration and control as defined under Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012). This risk based approach enables the Nanaimo Port Authority to conduct appropriate environmental effects evaluations and assessments of projects, and determine if any significant adverse environmental impacts are likely to occur, thus satisfying the requirements of Section 67 of CEAA 2012.

Lower-risk activities that are routine and predictable, which incorporate effective and established mitigation measures and environmental best practices may require less analysis while higher-risk activities will require more detailed review and scrutiny. This approach ensures that projects receive a risk assessment and review that is commensurate with the level of risk and likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects with carrying out the project.

There were no projects determined as likely to result in having significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.



## **National Research Council**

NRC's organizational and reporting structure helps ensure compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). Design and implementation of all projects and real property activities fall under the direction of the Director General of Administrative Services and Property Management Branch (ASPM). The Environmental Operations Office (EOO) works with groups within ASPM and across the NRC to ensure environmental issues are considered at the project proposal phase, in the project design and implementation, and includes consideration of alternatives. The EOO adopted a risk-based approach to determine the level of involvement and review required; standard mitigation measures are applied to lower-risk projects. In collaboration with Environment Canada and others, NRC developed protocols for review of projects and regulation/management of activities occurring in more sensitive areas (i.e., property providing habitat for species at risk, or projects of public or First Nations interest).

No NRC projects approved in 2014-15 were determined to likely cause significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Natural Resources Canada**

To fulfill its obligations to evaluate environmental impacts under sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012, Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) has an Environmental Effects Evaluation process. NRCan also collaborates with other government departments in managing joint projects and making determinations under CEAA 2012. For 2014-15, project proposals were reviewed across a range of subject areas, such as the installation and maintenance of seismic and satellite stations, and the installation of heating systems and of septic fields. In addition, NRCan's Environmental Management System provides a framework and tools for managing environmental aspects of facility operations at its sites across the country.

A tailored process has been developed and is being used by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) and NRCan to manage nuclear legacy liabilities at AECL sites. The Nuclear Legacy Liabilities Program (NLLP) focuses on improving the management of legacy radioactive waste, accelerating the decommissioning of outdated, unused buildings and structures and remediating lands impacted by prior operations. CEAA 2012 determinations are made based on a thorough review of the project description, AECL's Environmental Effects Review, and other pertinent documentation.

There were no projects determined as likely to result in having significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

## **Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada**

NSERC requires applicants to self-identify on applications for funding when any proposed activities are being undertaken outdoors, and the activities take place on federal lands or outside of Canada. These applications are reviewed to determine whether they constitute a project as defined under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), and any projects are in turn assessed in terms of their likelihood of having significant adverse environmental effects as described in CEAA 2012. Applicants who are requesting funding for a project, as defined in CEAA 2012, must provide detailed information on the component(s) of the environment that will be affected, and any relevant planned mitigation measures, follow-up programs, and/or monitoring that will be put in place. NSERC's Guidelines on Environmental Review and Assessment can be found here: [http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/policies-politiques/enviroassess-enviroeval\\_eng.asp](http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/policies-politiques/enviroassess-enviroeval_eng.asp)

For the period April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015, NSERC's review of projects concluded that none were likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects. In addition, NSERC was not the lead Federal Authority on any of the projects.

## **Oshawa Port Authority**

For the review of projects as defined under CEAA 2012, the Oshawa Port Authority uses an Environmental Management Approach for planned projects on federal lands under its administration and control. The management approach enables the Oshawa Port Authority to conduct appropriate Environmental Effects Evaluations and Determination for projects located on Oshawa Port Authority federal lands, to satisfy the requirements of section 67 of CEAA 2012.

Lower-risk activities that are routine and predictable, which incorporate effective and established mitigation measures and environmental best practices may require less analysis while higher-risk activities will require more detailed review and scrutiny. This approach ensures that projects receive a risk assessment and review that is commensurate with the level of risk and likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects with carrying out the project.

There were no projects determined as likely to result in having significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

## **Parks Canada Agency**

Parks Canada's mandate is to protect and present nationally significant examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage for present and future generations. Parks Canada's Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) process supports achievement of this mandate as well as the requirements of CEAA 2012, by providing a framework to evaluate potential adverse environmental effects of projects on the lands and waters Parks Canada administers.

Parks Canada maximizes EIA process efficiency by matching the depth of analysis to project risk. Best management practices are applied to routine projects with predictable effects. Basic analysis is used for projects of low-complexity and little public concern, and detailed analysis is undertaken for complex projects with high levels of public concern.

Parks Canada continued to refine its guidance documents and project tracking system, demonstrating its commitment to continuous improvement. Parks Canada renewed its training program in 2014-2015 and commenced an extensive staff training delivery effort to ensure consistent and efficient implementation of the EIA process across the protected areas it administers.

No projects with likely significant adverse environmental effects were identified during the current reporting period.

## **Port Alberni Port Authority**

The Port Alberni Port Authority (PAPA) employs an environmental management program that enables it to meet the requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. The program is focused on reviewing projects and activities that occur on federal lands within PAPA's administrative jurisdiction, thus satisfying the requirements of CEAA 2012; particularly Sections 67-69. Inclusive of this environmental effects approach are contracts and leases managed between PAPA and its tenants as well as works that may be conducted by tenants.

Nearly all of the current and recent works conducted by PAPA and its tenants are deemed to be routine, low-risk and incorporate effective environmental best practices. These activities have been demonstrated to have no to little environmental impacts. The latter of which are managed through acceptable mitigation measures.

Of all the projects and activities reviewed and monitored by PAPA during Fiscal Year 2014 none were deemed to cause or were expected to cause adverse environmental effects that could not be managed through established and effective mitigation measures.

## **Prince Rupert Port Authority**

The Prince Rupert Port Authority is responsible for managing federal property at the Port of Prince Rupert and for evaluating the environmental effects of projects to satisfy the requirements of Section 67 of CEEA 2012. Reference material developed by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency guides the environmental effects evaluation process.

For the fiscal year 2014, all projects reviewed by the Prince Rupert Port Authority were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, or were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with the application of appropriate environmental mitigation. Further information on major projects reviewed during this period is available on the Prince Rupert Port Authority's website at <http://www.rupertport.com/documents>

## **Public Health Agency of Canada**

The Public Health Agency of Canada continues to ensure that it is meeting its obligations under Section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* for activities related to real property on federal lands.

An internal procedure has been implemented that outlines the approach that project managers are to take in determining a project's likelihood to cause significant adverse environmental effects and in identifying proper mitigation measures. The procedure also identifies roles and responsibilities of the relevant parties.

The Public Health Agency of Canada determined that there were no projects likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

## **Public Works and Government Services Canada**

To ensure Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) complies with its obligations under Sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), the Department continues to implement the PWGSC national CEAA 2012 framework as a component of the departmental Environmental Compliance Management Program.

In order to render a CEAA 2012 determination the environmental services assessor reviews and analyzes the project information against established PWGSC project risk criteria. Risks are divided into three categories: high, medium, and low. The level of assessment and subsequent mitigation measures correspond to the level of risk. All determinations are documented in the CEAA 2012 component of the Environmental Services Ledger.

An audit of the CEAA 2012 framework implementation was undertaken in fiscal year 2013-2014. Audit recommendations were actioned and our CEAA 2012 framework has been modified.

To date, no PWGSC projects have been determined to pose significant adverse environmental effects, and, no projects have been referred to the Governor in Council.

PWGSC continues to provide CEAA 2012 advice and services to other federal departments and agencies.

## Québec Port Authority

The Québec Port Authority (QPA) commits to the community and all government bodies to limit as much as possible all negative impacts from its activities and those of its users on the environment, and make all projects socially acceptable. Consequently, the QPA requires from all project proponents settled on its land that an assessment of the environmental effects (AEE) be completed by a specialized and independent firm. AEE are received and studied by the QPA and allow the QPA and its proponents to respect all legal and other applicable requirements. Hereunder are examples of projects examined by the QPA over the past year:

- Dredging at wharf 105 and 106;
- Industrial design and preliminary studies of a sedimentation pond;
- Truck trajectory modification;
- Grey waters treatment unit improvement.

None of these projects were prone to generate a significant negative environmental impact. Only those projects presenting minor residual environmental impacts are permitted. Implementing recognized and effective mitigation measures along with an environmental monitoring and surveillance program enables the Port to efficiently manage residual environmental effects.

## Registry of the Competition Tribunal

The Competition Tribunal, established in 1986, is an independent, quasi-judicial tribunal established under the *Competition Tribunal Act* to hear applications brought by the Commissioner of Competition or a private party, depending on the circumstances, under various parts of the *Competition Act*. The purpose of the *Competition Act* is to maintain and encourage competition in Canada. The Tribunal hears applications related to deceptive marketing practices, such as misleading advertising, under Part VII.1. The Tribunal also has jurisdiction to hear references as well as applications brought pursuant to Part VIII, which sets out restrictive trade practices such as exclusive dealings.

The *Competition Tribunal Act* provides for an administrative infrastructure in support of the workings of the Competition Tribunal, through the Registry of the Competition Tribunal. The Registry of the Competition Tribunal was designated a department under Schedule I.1 of the *Financial Administration Act* until November 1, 2014, when the *Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada Act* came into force and consolidated the provision of support services of 11 administrative tribunals, including the Registry of the Competition Tribunal, into a new organization known as the Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada (ATSSC).

In view of the mandate of the Competition Tribunal, the Registry of the Competition Tribunal for the period of 1 April to October 31, 2014 and of the Administrative Tribunal Support Service of Canada for the period of 1 November 2014 to March 31, 2015, none of these organizations were involved in any projects that could have an adverse environmental effect.

## Royal Canadian Mounted Police

During the fiscal year 2014-15, the RCMP used an approach to evaluating the environmental effects of projects on federal lands that is in compliance with the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. Projects for which work was conducted outdoors were analyzed based on the following risk factors: project location (e.g. proximity to water bodies frequented by fish), project scale and scope (e.g. significant footprint) and type of operations that pose a higher risk of release of polluting substances. All projects carried out indoors, were considered 'routine' projects and determined to be of low risk with very little or no impact to the external environment. These projects were therefore not further evaluated.

The RCMP had no projects outside Canada in fiscal year 2014-15. In addition, there were no projects on federal lands where it was determined that significant adverse environmental effects were likely.

## **Saguenay Port Authority**

In all its activities, the Saguenay Port Authority (PSA) ensures that its environmental policy is complied with. This policy establishes the environmental principles to be applied in the management of its facilities, activities and operations on its territory and the planning of future developments. It aims to ensure that activities are planned and implemented according to the following criteria: compliance with the law; preventing and reducing to a minimum any environmental impact; protecting the quality of the environment and a concern to promote sustainable development.

To this end, each new project which may have a negative impact on the environment is the subject of a detailed assessment and a study of the potential environmental impacts is performed using independent experts.

During 2014, no project was deemed likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

## **Sept-Îles Port Authority**

The Sept-Îles Port Authority (SIPA) used the draft guidance document to establish the decision-making process in accordance with the requirements of Articles 67 to 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, 2012 and determine whether a project on its territory is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. After this process streamlined environmental assessment, the SIPA is able to authorize activities that have no anticipated environmental effects or for which conventional mitigation measures can be applied. Projects for which the impact on the environment or human population seems more likely to occur are subject to further assessment of environmental effects to determine the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects and to specify the mitigation measures required. The criteria used to determine which projects will follow this approach are based on the risk they pose to cause the release of a polluting substance into the environment or to degrade, disrupt or destroy fish habitat, migratory birds or species at risk and their habitats, or to raise public concerns.

The projects reviewed by the Sept-Îles Port Authority between April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014 and March 31, 2015 included:

- The construction by Hydro-Québec of a 161-kV electric line between the Arnaud substation and Aluminerie Alouette, in Sept-Îles (September 2014);
- The installation of two marine electrodes for improving the grounding system of Aluminerie Alouette, in Sept-Îles (November 2014).



## Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) is the federal research funding agency that promotes and supports research and research training in the humanities and social sciences. The management of SSHRC grants and awards funding is governed by the Tri-agency Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (the Agreement), which outlines the responsibilities of institutions that are eligible to administer funding on behalf of SSHRC, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). Eligible institutions include, but are not limited to, Canadian universities, colleges and research hospitals. The Agreement includes a requirement (section 3.10) that research institutions assist SSHRC in carrying out its responsibilities under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) by assisting applicants in preparing or commissioning documentation or reports that may be required and providing information upon request to assist SSHRC in meeting its obligations under the Act.

Applicants to SSHRC's funding opportunities whose proposed research or research-related activities may constitute a project as defined in Section 66 of CEAA 2012 review a list of questions, including whether the activities take place on federal lands or outside of Canada. If applicants answer positively to any of the series of questions, they must then complete the corresponding sections in the application material, which includes providing details about the component(s) of the environment that will be affected and any relevant planned mitigation measures, follow-up and/or monitoring programs. This information assists SSHRC staff in determining whether the research meets the definition of a project and, if so, the likelihood for significant adverse environmental effects as detailed in the Act. SSHRC's Corporate Strategy and Performance Division is responsible for the review process of funded applications, utilizing internal verification forms and tracking tools. In this past fiscal year, no SSHRC funded research was found to be a project as defined in CEAA 2012. This is consistent with SSHRC's reports for the past two fiscal years.

## **St. John's Port Authority**

The SJPA is committed to the protection of the environment; to that end, all projects undertaken by the Port Authority, or those projects undertaken by others which the Port Authority must grant approval, are reviewed in accordance with a comprehensive Environmental Checklist. This review is to confirm there will not be any significant adverse environmental effects from the project, and that short term effects are mitigated through the use of proven practices and procedures.

In the calendar year 2014, the following projects were reviewed:

- Site Operations Review Piers 6 to 8
- Building Condition Assessments at The Keg, Oceanex Maintenance Garage and Administration Building and Ellis Building
- Structural Repairs Harbourside Park
- Storm Drainage System Replacement Oceanex Terminal

## **Standards Council of Canada**

The Standards Council of Canada (SCC) is a federal Crown corporation. It has its mandate to promote efficient and effective standardization in Canada. The organization reports to Parliament through the Minister of Industry and oversees Canada's national standardization network.

Further to requirements to report activities under sections 67 to 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, note that the Standards Council of Canada does not undertake projects on federal lands or outside Canada.

## **Statistics Canada**

While Statistics Canada does not typically support large scale economic capital ventures that would likely create environmental impacts, to ensure compliance with its obligations under sections 67 to 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, it has developed an internal operational process for evaluating project environmental impacts using the Treasury Board Policy on the Management of Projects and the Project Complexity and Risk Assessment (PCRA).

The process outlines a risk-based approach for the assessment and reporting of environmental effects of projects proposed on federal lands that are subject to section 67 of *the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*.

Statistics Canada has determined that no projects carried out in 2014-2015 had cause for any significant environmental impact.

## **Thunder Bay Port Authority**

Thunder Bay Port Authority's Environmental Pledge guides its decisions and actions for the planning and development of the Port of Thunder Bay and commits its members and staff to environmental responsibility in the workplace.

The Thunder Bay Port Authority is required by section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* to determine whether projects on federal lands are likely to cause significant effects.

This obligation applies when a Federal Authority proposes to carry out a project or before it exercises a power or performs a duty or function that could permit the project to proceed. No project had the potential for significant adverse environmental effects during the 2014 calendar year.

## **Transport Canada**

Transport Canada continues to ensure that it is meeting CEAA 2012 federal lands obligations by reviewing and improving its Federal Lands Framework. The framework is used by departmental staff in meeting these obligations and clearly identifies the roles and responsibilities of all relevant parties. As part of this framework, Transport Canada staff complete Environmental Effect Determinations for projects subject to section 67. These determinations are used to identify potential environmental effects of the proposed project and include measures to mitigate those effects, if necessary. For fiscal year 2014-15, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

Transport Canada also works in collaboration with other CEAA 2012 authorities to address common issues related to federal lands obligations. The department continues to co-lead a federal lands working group for CEAA 2012 authorities, and led a separate working group tasked with the development of guidance specific to submerged federal lands. The guidance, a working-level document to assist Federal Authorities under CEAA 2012 with the operational determination of federal submerged lands, was finalized in October 2014. To complement the guidance document, Transport Canada also finalized an internal mapping tool to help officers determine if a project is located in the territorial sea of Canada.

## **Trois-Rivières Port Authority**

The Trois-Rivières Port Authority (TRPA)'s environmental management system enables ensuring compliance with the requirements of sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

Thus, in accordance with Section 71 of CEAA 2012, the TRPA advises that from January 1st, 2014, to December 31, 2014, projects administered by the TRPA, that took into account the implementation of mitigation measures as prescribed by expert advisors/consultants, were determined to not likely cause significant adverse environmental effects. Determinations are based on the interim guidance as distributed by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and a review of policies, plans, processes or procedures, roles and responsibilities, audit and feedback and continual improvement mechanisms.

Indeed, procedures have been developed to ensure that issues, regulatory requirements and environmental aspects are taken into account as part of the management of contracts and leases signed with tenants, and also where work is executed by tenants.

In addition, there is also a similar procedure for all projects executed by the TRPA. These procedures ensure that environmental effects are assessed for any project or work executed on port of Trois-Rivières property.

## **Vancouver Fraser Port Authority**

The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority (VFPA) is committed to conducting its operations in a responsible and sustainable manner that safeguards the environment and, where feasible and practicable, promotes continual improvement to its employees, customers and community partners.

As required by VFPA's Environment Policy, environmental reviews are conducted on all projects, physical works, and activities within VFPA jurisdiction or authority. The review considers the potential adverse environmental effects on land, air or water as a result of the project. Based on the scope of the project, the review includes assessment for fish and fish habitat, aquatic species, migratory birds, health and socio-economic conditions, physical and cultural heritage and the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.

Between January 1 and December 31, 2014, all projects reviewed by VFPA were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, or were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with the application of appropriate environmental mitigation.

Further information on the projects reviewed is provided in the 2014 table on VFPA's website at: <http://www.portmetrovanancouver.com/environment/environmental-reviews/>

## **Western Economic Diversification Canada**

The department of Western Economic Diversification (WD) has employed guidance circulated by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency to ensure a consistent approach to assessments under sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012.

WD assesses each project to ensure compliance with CEAA 2012 before approving a funding contribution. If required, WD accesses expertise and guidance from partner organizations to conduct environmental effects evaluations under section 67 of CEAA 2012 for all projects on federal lands. The assessments and guidance obtained inform WD's determinations under the CEAA 2012.

In 2014/2015, WD did not provide funding to a project on federal lands (or outside Canada).

Further information on WD's projects can be found at [www.wd.gc.ca](http://www.wd.gc.ca)

## **Windsor Port Authority**

In accordance with Section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, the Windsor Port Authority advises that from January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014, projects administered by the Windsor Port Authority, that took into account the implementation of mitigation measures as prescribed by expert advisors/consultants, were determined to not likely cause significant adverse environmental effects. Determinations are based on the Interim guidance as distributed by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and a review of policies, plans, processes or procedures, roles and responsibilities, audit and feedback and continual improvement mechanisms.