

**FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS**

**REGISTER OF PANEL PROJECTS  
AND BULLETIN**

---

**OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN  
FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE  
ENVIRONMENT CANADA  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO  
DECEMBER, 1979**

**PLEASE SEE PAGE 48  
FOR STAFF CHANGES IN FEAR0**

**Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1979**

Cat. No.: **EN103** - 5/1979-6

ISBN : 0 - 662 - 50171 - 3

**ISSN-0704-1985**

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS: BRIEF SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INFORMATION ON PANEL PROJECTS</b>	
<b>Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Arctic Pilot Project.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Banff National Park Highway Project.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Generation Project.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Boundary Bay Aerodrome . Reactivation.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>C.N. Telecommunications System . Wood Buffalo National Park.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Dempster Pipeline Project.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling - North Davis Strait Project.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. . Expansion of Uranium Refinery Capacity.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Fraser River Training Works Program.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Hamilton Airport Project.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Lower Churchill Hydro Electric Project.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Mackenzie Delta Gas Gathering System.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Polar Gas Project.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Quebec Port Expansion Project.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Vancouver International Airport -     Expansion of Air Traffic Capacity.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Yukon Transportation Study.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>LIST OF REVIEWED PANEL PROJECTS.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Point Lepreau NB Nuclear Generating Station.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Wreck Cove Hydro Electric Power Project.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline - Interim Report     July 27, 1977.....</b>	<b>41</b>

<b>Eldorado Nuclear Limited - Expansion of Uranium Refining Capacity - Port Granby, Ontario.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Shakwak Project (Haines Road/Alaska Highway) .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling - South Davis Strait Project.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Lancaster Sound Drilling Project.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Eldorado Nuclear Limited - Expansion of Uranium Refining Capacity - Ontario.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Roberts Bank Port Expansion.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project - Yukon Public Hearings.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Banff Highway Project.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE</b>	
<b>Staff Changes.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Administration and Staff.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Publications.....</b>	<b>55</b>

## INTRODUCTION

**The Register and bulletin provide public and private agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public with information on the Environmental Assessment and Review Process.**

**The contents are arranged as follows:**

1. **The Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process:  
Brief Summary**
2. **Information on Panel Projects**

**Projects submitted to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office for a formal, in-depth environmental assessment and review.**

**This section is subdivided as follows:**

- project title
- project location
- identification of proponent and/or initiator
- project description
- possible environmental impacts
- status under the Environmental Assessment and Review Process
- Panel members
- future events (or conclusions)

3. **List of Reviewed Projects**

**This section lists those projects that have been reviewed under the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process and on which an Environmental Assessment Panel has submitted its report to the Minister of the Environment. It also contains a brief outline of those reports.**

4. **General Information on the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office**

**This section provides information on the staff of the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, and general information on publications, etc.**

**FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS: BRIEF SUMMARY**

**The decision to institute a federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process for federal projects, programs and activities was made by Cabinet on December 20, 1973 and further amended on February 15, 1977.**

**By the 1973 Decision, the Minister of the Environment was directed to establish, in cooperation with other ministers, a process to ensure that federal departments and agencies:**

**take environmental matters into account throughout the planning and implementation of new projects, programs and activities;**

**carry out an environmental assessment for all projects which may have adverse effect on the environment before commitments or irrevocable decisions are made; projects which may have significant effects have to be submitted to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office for formal review;**

**use the results of these assessments in planning, decision-making and implementation.**

**Further the role of the Minister of the Environment in this area is also cited in the Government Organization Act, 1979. The Act states that the Minister "...shall initiate, recommend and undertake programs and co-ordinate programs of the Government of Canada, that are designed...to ensure that new federal projects, programs and activities are assessed early in the planning process for potential adverse effects on the quality of the natural environment and that a further review is carried out of those projects, programs and activities that are found to have probable significant adverse effects, and results thereof taken into account:..."**

**The Process established by the Minister of the Environment, through the Interdepartmental Committee on the Environment, is based essentially on the self-assessment approach. Departments and agencies are responsible for assessing the environmental consequences of their own projects and activities or those for which they assume the role of initiator, and deciding on the environmental significance of the anticipated effects.**

**As early in the planning phase as possible, the initiating department screens all projects for potential adverse environmental effects. One of the following four decisions is possible from this procedure:**

**a) No adverse environmental effects, no action needed;**

- b) Environmental effects are known and are not considered significant. Effects identified can be mitigated through environmental design and conformance to legislation/regulations. The initiator is responsible for taking the appropriate action but no further reference to the procedures of the Environmental Assessment and Review Process is required.
- c) The nature and scope of potential adverse environmental effects are not fully known. A more detailed assessment is required to identify environmental consequences and to assess their significance. The initiator therefore prepares or procures an Initial Environmental Evaluation (IEE). A review of the IEE will indicate to the Initiator whether alternative (b) above or (d) below should be followed.
- d) The initiator recognizes that significant environmental effects are involved and requests the Executive Chairman, Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, to establish a Panel to review the project.

If the Initiator decides to submit a project for Panel review, that project may not proceed until this review is completed and recommendations are made to the Minister of the Environment.

The Panel established by the Executive Chairman, Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, issues guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), by the Initiator or associated proponent, reviews the EIS, obtains the public response to the EIS and acquires additional information deemed necessary. It then advises the Minister of the Environment on the acceptability (or otherwise) of the residual environmental effects identified.

The Minister of the Environment and the Minister of the initiating department decide on the action to be taken on the report submitted by the Panel. These are implemented by the appropriate Ministers and associated proponents.

A detailed description of process procedures and Panel responsibilities, including the definitions of terms used can be found in the "Revised Guide to the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process" (May 1979) which may be obtained from the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, 13th Floor, Fontaine Bldg., Hull, Que. K1A 0H3.

ALASKA HIGHWAY GAS PIPELINE PROJECT

Location

Southern sector of the Yukon Territory.

Proponent

Foothills Pipelines (Yukon) Ltd.

Contact: 1600 - 205, 5th Avenue, S.W., Box 9083, Calgary, Alberta.  
T2P 2W4

Initiator

Northern Pipeline Agency

Contact: Mr. A.B. Yates, Deputy Administrator, 400 - 4th Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, Alberta

Description

Construction and operation of a buried gas transmission line to initially transport Alaska gas to U.S. markets in the lower 48 states. The proposed Yukon section of the line runs from Beaver Creek in the western corner of the Yukon, along the existing Alaska Highway for 512 miles to Watson Lake in the southeast Yukon. At its northern end the pipeline is proposed to connect to 732 miles of pipeline in Alaska, and at its southern end to 1500 miles of proposed line in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. The system will tie in at the 49th parallel with the U.S. system. The projected cost of the Beaver Creek to Watson Lake line is \$1.24 billion (1976 dollars).

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Degradation of permafrost, subsidence and possible rupture of pipeline.
2. Siltation of streams, interruption of migratory fish runs, destruction of spawning and rearing areas.
3. Displacement of wildlife species such as Dall sheep from their traditional range.



### Status Under EARP

The project was referred for formal Panel review in March 1977, and the Panel was formed in May, 1977. Panel members are:

**F.G. Hurtubise**  
Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Environment Canada, Ottawa  
(Chairman)

**O. Hughes**  
Geological Survey of Canada  
Dept. of Energy, Mines and  
Resources  
Calgary, Alberta

**C.E. Wykes**  
Director, Yukon Branch  
Environmental Protection Service  
Environment Canada  
Whitehorse, Yukon

**R. G. Morrison**  
Chief, Environmental  
Assessment Division  
Dept. of Indian Affairs and  
Northern Development  
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière  
Hull, Quebec

**D.S. Lacate**  
Director, Pacific Region  
Lands Directorate  
Environment Canada  
Vancouver, B.C.

**L. Chambers**  
Deputy Head  
Dept. of Renewable Resources  
Yukon Territorial Government  
Whitehorse, Yukon

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J.B. Duffy, FEARO,**  
13th Floor, Fontaine Bldg.,  
Hull K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

The normal procedure for environmental impact assessment provides for the establishment of an Assessment Panel which issues formal guidelines for the preparation of an environmental impact statement, conducts technical and public reviews of the statement and makes recommendations to the Minister of the Environment concerning project implementation. In this case, however, the federal government faced major decisions on competing pipeline proposals in the fall of 1977. The short lead time available to the Panel made a full environmental assessment and review of the project impossible at the time. Instead, the Minister instructed the Panel to review existing data, seek public and professional opinion and prepare an interim report by August 1, 1977 on the understanding that, if the project was a contender after decisions on competing proposals had been made, the normal panel procedure involving a full and complete review of the project would apply. Submission of an interim report by August 1 enabled the government to consider environmental factors associated with this project in its decision-making process. The report outlined the major environmental issues known at the time and identified the major data deficiencies.

The Panel held a preliminary meeting in May 1977 in Whitehorse to inform the public of the project and to obtain public feedback on the procedures

for the substantive hearings. The first part of the hearings were held June 13 to 17 in Whitehorse and dealt with the identification of environmental concerns. Community meetings along the proposed pipeline route were also held in May and June. The Panel conducted the second phase of the hearings, commencing July 5 in Whitehorse. This phase concentrated on obtaining further information from the public and from technical experts assigned to assist the Panel on the concerns raised in the June meeting.

The Panel delivered its report to the Minister in early August, 1977. The Governments of Canada and of the U.S.A. agreed in September, 1977 to use the Alaska Highway route for the southern transport of Alaska gas. Guidelines for a detailed environmental impact statement were issued to the proponent and the initiating department in December, 1977. The guidelines are available to interested parties on request.

An Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by the Proponent and distributed for public and technical review in January, 1979. Public hearings were held in Yukon communities, including Whitehorse, in March and April of 1979. The Panel concluded (on April 28, 1979) that the Proponent had not provided sufficient information, on certain aspects of the project, to enable the Panel to complete its environmental review at that time.

The Panel prepared a report requiring that the Proponent complete its assessment of the project. This report was transmitted to the Minister of the Environment and authorized for public release in September, 1979. After completion of the revised EIS, the Panel will reconvene the public technical hearings. Following the hearings, the Panel will report to the Federal Minister of the Environment on the adequacy of environmental planning on the project.

#### Panel Documents

Guidelines for the preparation of the EIS.  
Panel Reports of August, 1977 and September, 1979.

ARCTIC PILOT PROJECT

Location

**Melville Island and waters of Barrow Strait, Lancaster Sound and the Eastern Arctic.**

Initiator

**Department of Indian and Northern Affairs**

**Contact: W Mills, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0H4**

**Petro-Canada (for contact see Proponent)**

Proponent

**Petro-Canada**

**Contact: Menno Homan, P. O. Box 2844, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M7**

Description

**Involved in this project would be the construction of a small number of wells in the Drake Point area of Melville Island, a small gas plant, a pipeline to carry natural gas from the Drake Point area to Bridport Inlet on Southern Melville Island, a liquid natural gas plant to process 250 million cubic feet per day of gas, a harbor facility at Bridport capable of year around operation, and icebreaking LNG carriers designed to operate between Bridport Inlet and an east coast port on a year around basis.**

Possible Environmental Impacts

**Possible environmental impacts could include effects on wildlife, terrain and vegetation, marine mammals and bird populations, and on fish and fish food organisms.**

Status Under EARP

**The project was referred for Panel consideration by both Petro-Canada and the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs in November 1977. An Environmental Statement has been prepared and has been circulated to government agencies for review. The Panel received comments on the Environmental Statement in May. On the basis of these comments and its own review, the Panel issued "Draft Guidelines for Completion of the Environmental Assessment" on June 15 and invited public and government agency comments on the guidelines by August 1. The submission received from government agencies were included in this document. Guidelines for Completion of the Environmental Assessment were issued in September 1979.**

**Panel members are:**

**J. S. Klenavic**  
**Associate Executive Chairman**  
**Federal Environmental**  
**Assessment Review Office**  
**Ottawa, Ontario**  
**(Chairman)**

**M O. Berry**  
**Arctic Hydrology Section**  
**Atmospheric Environment Service**  
**Environment Canada**  
**Ottawa, Ontario**

**R. W. Hornal**  
**Regional Director**  
**Northern Operations**  
**Dept. of Indian and**  
**Northern Affairs**  
**Yellowknife, NWT**

**D. G. B. Brown**  
**Canadian Wildlife Service**  
**Environment Canada**  
**Dartmouth, N.S.**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: R. G. Connelly**

**Future Events**

**The completed EIS is expected from Petro-Canada in early 1980.**

**Public meetings are expected to take place during spring 1980.**

**Panel Documents**

**Draft Guidelines for the Completion of the Environmental Assessment and Submissions on the Petro-Canada Environmental Statement (January 1979). Guidelines for the Completion of the Environmental Assessment for the Arctic Pilot Project (September 1979).**

**BANFF NATIONAL PARK HIGHWAY PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Location**

**The Trans-Canada Highway in Banff National Park from the eastern gate to Healy Creek. (27 kilometres)**

**Proponent**

**Federal Department of Public Works**

**Contact: F. Kimball, Public Works Canada, 9925 - 109 St., Edmonton, Alta.**

**Description**

**The proposal is for improvements to the existing highway to resolve traffic flow problems including increase to 4 lanes and interchange modifications. Relocation of the railroad and alternative routings along the Bow Valley for the extra lanes are under study.**

**Possible Environmental Impacts**

**Effect on ungulates and other fauna due to habitat modifications.  
Disturbance of landforms due to road-cuts and borrow pits plus general visual impact.  
Land use policy implications of increased traffic capacity through a national park.  
Loss of forest cover.**

**Status Under EARP**

**The project was referred for Panel review in May 1978. A Panel has been formed. Panel members are:**

**J. S. Klenavic  
Associate Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)**

**R. G. W. Edwards  
Manager, Environmental Protection  
and Surveillance  
Alberta District Office, EPS  
Environment Canada  
Edmonton, Alberta**

**W R. Binks  
Professional Engineer  
Ottawa, Ontario**

**J. Hartley  
Chief of Planning  
Parks Canada Western Region  
Calgary, Alberta**

**W Ross  
Environmental Sciences  
Faculty of Environmental  
Design  
University of Calgary, Alberta**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J. Paradine**

The review is taking place in two parts (km 0 to 13 and km 13 to 27).  
Public meetings for km 0 to 13 took place in June, 1979 and the Panel report on this section was issued in October 1979.

Future Events

The Panel review of km 13 to 27 will take place at a later date.

Panel Documents

Guidelines for the preparation of an EIS  
Written submissions to the Panel.  
Panel Report km 0 to 13.

**BAY OF FUNDY TIDAL POWER GENERATION PROJECT**

**Location**

Chignecto Bay and Minas Basin sites, upper Bay of Fundy, New Brunswick/  
Nova Scotia.

**Initiator**

Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Review Board, Mr. R.H. Clark, 997-2108

**Description**

A study entitled "Reassessment of Fundy Tidal Power" dated November 1977 has been released by the initiator and provides a detailed description of the proposed project which would involve a tidal barrier, generating plant and transmission lines. Discussions are taking place between the Federal and Provincial governments on cost-sharing of detailed engineering environmental studies.

**Possible Environmental Impacts**

Specific areas of impact are not yet known. Some general areas include:

1. Limitations or restrictions on resource use by man.
2. Impacts on ecosystem stability in terrestrial and marine environments.
3. Large borrow pit, quarrying and hauling operations.

**Status Under EARP**

The project was referred for Panel review in April 1977. The Panel was formed October 1977 and two non-government members were added in June 1978.

F.G. Hurtubise  
Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)

Arthur Collin  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
Atmospheric Environment Service  
Environment Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario

Robert Bailey  
Executive Secretary  
Coastal Zone Management  
N.S. Dept. of the Environment  
P.O. Box 2107  
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Owen Washburn  
Director  
Environmental Services Branch  
N.B. Dept. of the Environment  
P.O. Box 6000  
Fredericton, N.B.

**Leo Brandon**  
**Director General**  
**Atlantic Region**  
**Environmental Management Service**  
**Environment Canada**  
**P.O. Box 5111**  
**Bedford, N.S.**

**J. G. Ogden III**  
**Professor of Biology**  
**Dalhousie University**  
**Halifax, N.S.**

**T. W Goff**  
**Assistant Professor of Sociology**  
**Munt Allison University**  
**Sackville, N.B.**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J. Paradine**

#### **Future Events**

**A public information and participation program to enable the public to be informed of and become involved in the environmental impact assessment has been prepared and distributed. This includes discussion of the impact statement guidelines as well as public review of the impact statement.**

**Draft environmental impact statement guidelines have been distributed to the public for comment at future public meetings. These will be held after a decision to proceed with detailed studies has been announced. As a result of these meetings the guidelines will be finalized and forwarded to the initiator proponent upon incorporation of public comment.**

#### **Panel Documents**

**Draft guidelines.**



REACTIVATION OF BOUNDARY BAY AIRPORT

Location

**Delta, British Columbia. The site is located some 25 miles south of Vancouver, near Boundary Bay.**

Initiator

**Federal Department of Transport  
(Canadian Air Transportation Administration).**

**Contact: C. Heed, Pacific Regional Manager, Airports, Transport Canada,  
739 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1A2**

Description

**The project was proposed as a result of the Master Planning exercise conducted by the initiator for the Lower Mainland area of British Columbia. For the general aviation aircraft category, the Plan concluded that by 1982 all of the existing capacity of the region's airports would be required plus a new airport. Reactivation of Boundary Bay would serve this purpose and would also encourage the shift of light aircraft from Vancouver International where there is currently a safety problem resulting from an undesirable mix of light aircraft and heavy jets. It is projected that only propeller driven planes under 12,500 lbs. would use Boundary Bay. Projected costs and start of construction dates are not yet known.**

Possible Environmental Impacts

- 1. The site is a major congregation area for migratory birds on the Pacific flyway. Changes in use of the site such as a new airport could have international repercussions.**
- 2. The site is near large areas of agricultural land that is a central feeding area for wintering waterfowl.**

Status Under EARP

**The project was referred to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office for Panel review in October 1976. The Panel was formed in March 1977. Panel members are:**

**F.G. Hurtubise,  
Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
(Chairman)**

**J.P. Sexter, Head  
Environmental Services Section  
Environmental Studies Division  
British Columbia Ministry of  
Environment, Victoria, B.C.**

**V. C. Brink**  
**Agronomist**  
**Vancouver, B. C.**

**S. Veit**  
**Social Science Researcher**  
**Esquimalt, B. C.**

**L. I. Retfalvi, Head**  
**Habitat & Ecological Assessment**  
**Canadian Wildlife Service**  
**Environment Canada**  
**Vancouver, B. C.**

**A. A. Bach**  
**Regional Administrator**  
**C. A. T. A.**  
**Transport Canada**  
**Vancouver, B. C.**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P. F. Scott, FEARO,**  
**700-789 West Pender, Vancouver, B. C.**  
**V6C 1H2**  
**(604) 666-2431**

**The Panel issued draft guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for public and government agency comment and held a public meeting July 26, 1978, to hear comments. Final guidelines were issued to the initiator September 11, 1978. The initiator submitted the Environmental Impact Statement to the Panel in late February 1979 at which time it was given wide public distribution. The public input aspects of the Panel review were completed in late June, 1979, with the holding of five days of public meetings to discuss the project.**

#### **Future Events**

**The Panel is now in the process of writing its final report to the Minister.**

#### **Panel Documents**

**Written Submissions to the Panel on the Draft EIS Guidelines**  
**Transcript of Public Meeting on the Draft EIS Guidelines (\$3.00)**  
**Guidelines for Preparing the EIS**  
**Written submissions to the Environmental Assessment Panel**  
**Transcripts of the Public Hearings (\$5.00).**

**CN TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM - WOOD BUFFALO NATIONAL PARK**

**Location**

Northern section of Wood Buffalo National Park, Alberta and Northwest Territories.

**Proponent**

Canadian National Telecommunications

Contact: A.J. Kuhr, President, C.N. Telecommunications, 151 Front Street,  
Toronto, Ontario. M6J 1G1

**Initiator**

Parks Canada, Department of the Environment

Contact: S.F. Kun, Director, National Parks Branch, Parks Canada,  
Department of the Environment, Ottawa, Ontario. K1A 0H4

**Description**

The proposed system consists of the construction of two 500 foot microwave towers and support systems in the northern section of Wood Buffalo National Park. The purpose of this system is to improve communications between Hay River (NWT), Fort Smith (NWT), and Fort Chipewyan (Alberta). The estimated cost is \$0.75 to \$1.25 million.

**Possible Environmental Impacts**

1. Disruption of the breeding grounds of the whooping crane.
2. Obstruction and interference to whooping cranes moving around their breeding grounds, and to the cranes' migration routes.
3. Landscape aesthetics of the National Park.

**Status Under EARP**

The project was referred for Panel review in April, 1977. Discussions are presently taking place involving C.N. Telecommunications, Parks Canada and the Department of Communications concerning alternative systems which would eliminate any hazard to the whooping cranes nesting in the Park.

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J.B. Duffy, FEARO, 13th Floor,  
Fontaine Building, Hull K1A 0H3  
(819) 997-1000.

**Future Events**

The Panel review has been suspended pending further clarification of the project.

DEMPSTER PIPELINE PROJECT

Location

Mackenzie Delta, Northwest Territories, to a point at or near Whitehorse, Yukon Territory.

Proponent

Foothills Pipelines (Yukon) Limited.

Contact: 1600 - 205, 5th Avenue, S.W., Box 9083, Calgary, Alberta.  
T2P 2W4

Initiator

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

Contact: Dr. O. Løken, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H4

Description

Construction and operation of a gas pipeline for transmission of Mackenzie Delta Gas in the Northwest Territories to a point at or near Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory to link up with the projected Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline. The route will follow closely the Dempster Highway and the Klondike Highway.

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Degradation of permafrost-rich terrain
2. Siltation effects, disturbance of fish habitats and fish migration
3. Displacement of wildlife species
4. Specific adverse effects on Porcupine Caribou herd
5. Aesthetic effects

Status Under EARP

The project was referred to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in January, 1978. Panel members are:

P.J. B. Duffy  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)

C. E. Wykes  
Director, Yukon Branch  
Environmental Protection  
Service  
Environment Canada  
Whitehorse, Yukon

**J.P. Kelsall**  
**Canadian Wildlife Service**  
**Environment Canada**  
**5421 Robertson Road**  
**Delta, B.C.**

**M Hawkes**  
**Supervisor**  
**Environmental Management**  
**Fish and Wildlife Service**  
**Government of the N.W.T.**  
**Yellowknife, N.W.T.**

**J.A. Heginbottom**  
**Geological Survey of Canada**  
**Energy, Mines and Resources**  
**Ottawa, Ontario**

**R. G. Morrison**  
**Chief, Environmental**  
**Assessment Division**  
**Dept. of Indian and**  
**Northern Affairs**  
**Les Terrasses de la Chaudière**  
**Hull, Quebec**

**L. Chambers**  
**Deputy Head**  
**Department of Renewable Resources**  
**Yukon Territorial Government**  
**Whitehorse, Yukon.**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J.B. Duffy, FEARO,**  
**13th Floor, Fontaine Bldg.,**  
**Hull, K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000**

**Formal guidelines for the preparation of an environmental impact statement have been issued publicly and are available from the Panel Secretary.**

**The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs has deferred the submission of the EIS to the Environmental Assessment Panel for public review until the Company has completed their frost have studies, especially those at the Fairbanks, Alaska test site, and has considered the results from these studies in their pipeline design.**

#### **Future Events**

- 1. The Panel will conduct a technical and public review of the environmental impact statement when it is received.**
- 2. The Panel will subsequently make recommendations to the Minister of the Environment concerning the implementation of the project.**

#### **Panel Documents**

**Guidelines for the preparation of the EIS.**

EASTERN ARCTIC OFFSHORE DRILLING - NORTH DAVIS STRAIT PROJECT

Location

**Waters of the north-eastern coast of Baffin Island.**

Initiator

**Department of Indian and Northern Affairs**

**Contact: M Ruel, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudiere, Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0H4**

Proponent:

**Petro-Canada**

**Contact: Gerry Glazier, P.O. Box 2844, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M7**

Description

**Exploratory drilling for hydrocarbon in the waters of the Eastern Arctic.**

Possible Environmental Impacts

**Environmental impacts of offshore drilling may be manifested in several ways, but the most severe situation would likely occur in the case of an uncontrolled wellhead blowout causing the release of oil.**

**The waters along the east coast of Baffin Island are characterized by some of the most adverse physical conditions for offshore drilling in Canada's coastal region, thereby increasing the concern for the environment. The eastern Arctic is rich in biological resources. Many thousands of marine mammals and millions of seabirds reproduce in, and migrate through, the area each year.**

Status Under EARP

**The project was referred for Panel review in July, 1977. A task force has developed guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. The Environmental Impact Statement is presently being prepared.**

**Panel members are:**

**J.S. Klenavic  
Associate Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)**

**E.J. Sandeman  
Department of Fisheries and Oceans  
Newfoundland Biological Station  
Water Street East  
St. John's, Newfoundland**

**M J. Mbrison**  
**Assistant Regional Director**  
**of Non-Renewable Resources**  
**Dept. of Indian and Northern Affairs**  
**P.O. Box 1500**  
**Yellowknife, NWT**  
**XOE 1H0**

**J. R. MacDonald**  
**Environmental Protection Service**  
**Department of Environment**  
**Halifax, Nova Scotia**  
**B3J 3E4**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.G. Connelly.**

**Future Events**

**Public meetings will be scheduled after the receipt of the Environmental Impact Statement.**

**Panel Documents**

**Guidelines for preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for Eastern Arctic Offshore Exploratory Drilling.**

ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED - EXPANSION OF URANIUM REFINING CAPACITY

Location

A potential site for the proposed refinery has been selected near Warman, Saskatchewan.

Initiator

Eldorado Nuclear Ltd.

Contact: R. Dakers, Vice-President, Eldorado Nuclear Ltd., 255 Albert Street, Suite 400, Ottawa, Ontario. K1P 6A9

Description

The proposed refinery would process yellowcake primarily from Saskatchewan mines to produce: 9,000 metric tons per annum of intermediate and refined uranium products including uranium hexafluoride.

Possible Environmental Impacts

Possible environmental impacts could include effects of air and water emissions, solid waste disposal and effects on agricultural and neighbouring land.

Status under EARP

This project along with a proposal to construct a refinery in Ontario was referred to a Panel for review in July 1975. Guidelines for an Environmental Impact Statement were developed for both the Ontario and Saskatchewan projects by the Environmental Assessment Panel formed for the Ontario review. These were issued to Eldorado in June 1976. After study of 14 potential locations, Warman, near Saskatoon, has been selected by Eldorado for detailed environmental assessment. The EIS was distributed for comments in July 1979 and a Compendium of comments was issued in November 1979.

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R. G. Connelly

Future Events

Public meetings to review the project are planned to take place during January 1980. These will be held in Saskatoon and the nearby community of Martensville.

Panel Documents

Guidelines for an Environmental Impact Statement.  
Environmental Impact Statement (July 1979)  
Compendium of Comments on EIS (Nov. 1979)



FRASER RIVER TRAINING WORKS PROGRAM  
(Deepening of Fraser River Shipping Channel)

Location

Fraser River Estuary, New Westminster to Georgia Strait, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Initiator

Federal Department of Public Works

Contact: E. O. Isfeld, Marine and Civil Engineering, Public Works Canada,  
1110 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, B.C. V6E 3W5

Description

Upgrading of the channel to a standard enabling safe passage on a year round basis for the current types of vessels in common usage. Proposed method of achieving this objective is by installation of training works to enable the river to become primarily self-scouring in specific areas of the main shipping channel to a depth sufficient to provide a maximum 40' draft.

Construction is projected over a 5 year period. Estimated cost (1976 dollars) is \$31 million.

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Changes in water quality - sedimentation, salinity, effects of training walls.
2. Changes in aquatic and marsh flora and also invertebrates including variation in area of productive habitat in backwaters and mudflats.
3. Fish populations - fluctuations in area of available productive habitat, deterrents to migratory adult salmon, premature exposure of juvenile salmon to salt water.
4. Alteration of some bar fishing areas.
5. Effect of any increased velocity on commercial fishing vessels and on efficiency of gillnet fishing boats and other marine traffic. (Both positive and negative impacts will be assessed.)

Status Under EARP

Panel formed July 1976. Members are:

J.S. Klenavic  
Associate Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)

F.C. Boyd  
Chief of Habitat Protection Division  
Resource Services Branch  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Vancouver, B.C.

**K. Kupka**  
**Director,**  
**Environmental Services Branch**  
**Environmental Protection Service**  
**Environment Canada**  
**West Vancouver, B.C.**

**E.M. Clark**  
**Regional Director**  
**Pacific Region**  
**Inl and Waters Directorate**  
**Environment Canada**  
**Vancouver, B.C.**

**J.P. Secter, Head**  
**Environmental Services Section**  
**Environmental Studies Division**  
**British Columbia Ministry of**  
**the Environment**  
**Victoria, B.C.**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.F. Scott, FEARO**  
**700-789 West Pender St.,**  
**Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1H2**  
**(604) 666-2431**

**Guidelines for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**  
**have been issued by the Panel and are available to the public. Public Works**  
**Canada has engaged a consultant to prepare the EIS. The EIS is expected to**  
**be completed and submitted to the Panel in early 1980.**

#### **Future Events**

**The Panel will initiate a public review of the EIS as soon as it has been**  
**received from Public Works.**

#### **Panel Documents**

**Initial Environmental Evaluation Prepared by Public Works Canada**

HAMILTON AIRPORT EXPANSION PROJECT

**Location**

**Hamilton (Munt Hope), Ontario**

**Initiator**

**Federal Department of Transport (Canadian Air Transportation Administration).**

**Contact: David Thomas, System Planning Branch, Ontario Region  
Transport Canada, 4900 Yonge Street North, Suite 300,  
Willowdale, Ontario, M2N 6A5**

**Description**

**The selection, from among several options, of an airport expansion plan for the future development of air transportation facilities and services for the Hamilton area. Options include different configurations of an expansion of the existing airport. Projected cost and development schedule details are dependent upon the configuration selected.**

**Possible Environmental Impacts**

**The environmental effects will vary according to the configuration being considered. Some of the possible environmental effects determined from initial studies conducted are:**

- 1. Limited withdrawal of agricultural land.**
- 2. Increased runoff to feeder streams causing increased susceptibility to erosion, reduced rates of ground water recharge and stream siltation.**
- 3. Increased ground traffic and its associated noise.**
- 4. A certain segment of the population would be affected by increased aircraft noise.**
- 5. Stream siltation and effects on fish spawning due to construction activity.**

status Under EARP

he project was officially referred for Panel review, July 1976. The Panel was formed October 1976.

**Panel members are:**

**Patrick J.B. Duffy**  
**Federal Environmental Assessment**  
**Review Office**  
**Ottawa, Ontario**  
**(Chairman)**

**Peter G. McInnis**  
**Klein & Sears**  
**147 Davenport Road**  
**Toronto, Ontario**

**Alan McDonald**  
**Policy & Program Development**  
**Directorate**  
**Environmental Management Service**  
**Environment Canada**  
**Ottawa, Ontario**  
**K1A 0E7**

**Joseph E. Piercy**  
**Acoustics Laboratory**  
**Division of Physics**  
**National Research Council**  
**Ottawa, Ontario**

**Rolf Hedman**  
**Transport Canada**  
**4900 Yonge Street**  
**Toronto, Ontario**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J.B. Duffy, FEARO,**  
**13th Floor, Fontaine Bldg.,**  
**Hull, K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000**

**Transport Canada will make known its choice from the three final configurations under consideration.**

**LOWER CHURCHILL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT**

**Gull Island & Muskrat Falls Generation sites**

**Labrador/Newfoundland Electric power transmission line & tunnel**

**Location**

- a) Gull Island & Muskrat Falls on the Lower Churchill River
- b) Transmission line from Churchill Falls across Labrador to the Strait of Belle Isle and across the Island of Newfoundland to near St-John's.

**Proponent**

**Lower Churchill Development Corporation (L.C.D.C.)**

**Contact: B. Ledrew, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, St. John's,  
Newfoundland, A1A 2X8**

**Initiator**

**Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources**

**Contact: Dr. R. G. Skinner, Departmental Coordinator  
Energy, Mines and Resources, 580 Booth Street, Ottawa, Ontario.  
K1A 0E4.**

**Description**

**The Lower Churchill Development Corporation is evaluating two dam sites on the Lower Churchill River; at Gull Island and Muskrat Falls. Power generated from either or both of these sites would be passed via extra high-tension DC transmission lines to the Island of Newfoundland. An AC intertie with the Churchill Falls power development on the Upper Churchill River would also be provided.**

**Possible Environmental Impacts**

- a) Damsites
  - 1. The dams would create a reservoir which will impact on wildlife, fish and other resources.
  - 2. The construction camps and borrow areas will impact on areas of wilderness quality and on the wildlife and aquatic resources.
  - 3. Construction activities, including reservoir preparation, will have short-term and long-term effects on fish rearing areas and fish habitat.

**b) Transmission line**

- 1. The transmission line will impact on moose, caribou and arctic hare populations.**
- 2. The line will impact on areas of wilderness quality.**
- 3. The construction of the line is potentially dangerous to certain fish species such as Atlantic salmon, brook trout, i.e. in the crossing of some 15 river systems significant for the production of these fish species.**
- 4. Construction of the proposed Belle Isle Strait tunnel could have an effect on both fish and marine animals, i.e. blasting could disrupt migration patterns of cod, Atlantic salmon and harp seal.**
- 5. Construction of the line could affect sensitive land types such as organic areas and unstable river crossings.**

**Status Under EARP**

**This project was under consideration before the federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process became operational. In December 1974, a preliminary environmental overview was produced under a federal-provincial cost-shared agreement. Subsequently, Panels were formed to look at Gull Island and the transmission line. With the referral of the Muskrat Falls site in 1979, the Panels were amalgamated and Panel members now include:**

**J.S. Klenavic  
Associate Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)**

**F.C. Pollett  
Newfoundland Forest  
Research Centre  
Environment Canada  
St. John's, Newfoundland**

**J.H.C. Pippy  
Fisheries and Marine Service  
Newfoundland Biological Station  
Department of Fisheries and Oceans  
Water Street, East  
St. John's, Newfoundland**

**G.E. Beanlands  
Director, Lands Directorate  
Atlantic Region  
Halifax, N.S.**

**E.M. Warnes  
Chief, Generation and Transmission  
Energy, Mines & Resources Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario**

**Irene M Baird  
Director of Social Policy  
Planning and Priorities Secretariat  
Executive Council, Confederation  
Bldg.  
St. John's, Newfoundland**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J. Paradine**

- a) **Guidelines for the generation sites environmental impact statement have been issued and environmental studies are being carried out during 1978/1979.**
- b) **The Panel did not produce guidelines for the transmission line as a preliminary environmental impact statement was in existence. Following public and technical agency review of the EIS, the Panel published a statement of issues requiring further information. LCDC is presently preparing a response to the Panel's statement.**

#### **Future Events**

**Public meetings for the transmission line will take place after receipt of LCDC's response. Meetings on the generation sites will take place after receipt of the EIS and public and technical review of its contents; probably during 1980.**

#### **Panel Documents**

**Guideline for the preparation of the EIS for generation sites  
Comments submitted to the Panel on transmission line and statement of issues requiring further attention.**

**MACKENZIE DELTA GAS GATHERING SYSTEM**

**Location**

**Mackenzie River Delta Region, Northwest Territories**

**Proponents**

**Imperial Oil, Gulf Oil and Shell Oil**

**Initiator**

**Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.**

**Contact: Dr. O. Løken DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudiere, Ottawa,  
Ontario. K1A 0H4**

**Description**

**Construction and operation of three gas processing plants and transportation facilities by the above oil companies to supply a Dempster pipeline moving gas south to market in southern Canada. In the summer of 1977 these three projects were suspended. However, an environmental impact statement for the Imperial Oil plant (Taglu) has been prepared for review. The estimated cost of the Taglu development (Imperial Oil) is \$500 million (1975 dollars).**

**Possible Environmental Impacts**

- 1. Removal and/or disturbance of vegetation during construction resulting in permafrost degradation and or soil erosion.**
- 2. Temporary disturbance or displacement of wildlife and harassment causing seasonal or permanent abandonment of habitats.**
- 3. Reduction of productivity caused by disturbing nesting populations in adjacent migrating bird sanctuaries and at other nesting sites.**
- 4. Permafrost degradation under and around pads and dykes used for site developments. Thaw settlement could be extensive on ice rich soils and dyke failure could release toxic substances which could affect terrestrial and aquatic habitats.**
- 5. Extraction of certain construction materials and timber could have an important bearing on terrain and vegetation disturbance, wildlife and aquatic resources.**
- 6. Large volumes of fuels and chemicals stored at these sites and associated transfer operations present potentials for spills into adjacent river channels.**



### **Status Under EARP**

The official request for Panel review was received in January 1975, and the Panel was formed in the same month. Panel members are:

**J.S. Klenavic**  
Associate Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office, Ottawa  
(Chairman)

**M.J. Mbrison**  
Assistant Regional Director  
Non-Renewable Resources  
Dept. of Indian and Northern  
Affairs  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

**A.W. Mansfield**  
Director, Arctic Biological Station  
Fisheries and Marine Service  
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans  
Ste-Anne de Bellevue, P.Q.

**R. Frith**  
Environmental Protection Service  
Environment Canada  
Edmonton, Alberta

Executive Secretary to the Panel: **P.J.B. Duffy, FEARO, 13th Floor,  
Fontaine Bldg. Hull K1A 0H3  
(819) 9974000**

Guidelines for the production of the environmental impact statement were issued to the initiator May, 1975. They are available to the public.

### **Future Events**

The Taglu environmental impact statement will be available in the future for technical review. In connection with the Dempster Pipeline Project (described in this register) an overview will be submitted by the initiator to consolidate the description and mitigation of gas processing plant and pipeline impacts. The Panel will make arrangements for technical and public review of the Taglu environmental impact statement after which a report to the Minister will be prepared.

### **Panel Documents**

Guidelines for the preparation of the EIS.

## **POLAR GAS PROJECT**

### **Location**

High Arctic Islands via Northwest Territories to markets in southern Canada.

### **Proponents**

Polar Gas Consortium and Panarctic Gas Ltd.

Contact: J. Riddick, Polar Gas Project, P.O. Box 90,  
Commerce Court West, Toronto, Ontario. M5L 1H3

### **Co-Initiators**

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (for Northwest Territories portion).

Contact: M Ruel, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Ottawa, Ontario.  
K1A 0H4

Department of Energy, Mines and Resources (for area south of 60th parallel).

Contact: R.G. Skinner, Science and Technology, EMR, 580 Booth St.,  
Ottawa, Ontario. K1A 0E4

### **Description**

The project includes extraction and purification of gas from fields in the High Arctic, and construction of a large diameter pipeline for natural gas transmission through the Northwest Territories and one or more provinces to a junction with an existing pipeline in southern Canada. The projected total cost for the pipeline component, south from Spence Bay ranges from \$4.5 billion to \$6.2 billion, the variation being a function of the route taken.

### **Possible Environmental Impacts**

The general impact could be similar to related Arctic pipeline projects in Canada and the U.S. e.g. effects on fish, animal and bird habitats, disruption of terrain and vegetation, degradation of permafrost-rich terrain.

### **Status Under EARP**

An official request for a Panel review was received in November 1975. A Federal Government Task Force was set up in February 1975 to produce draft EIS guidelines for an Environmental Assessment Panel. The Panel was formed in March 1976.

**Members are:**

**J.S. Klenavic**  
Associate Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)

**J.A. Heginbottom**  
Geological Survey of Canada  
Energy, Mines and Resources  
Ottawa, Ontario

**D.P. Scott**  
Fisheries and Marine Service  
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans  
501 University Crescent  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

**Allan H. Jones**  
Indian and Northern Affairs  
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière  
Ottawa, Ontario

**F.A. Doe**  
Chief, Environmental Assessment  
& Review Support  
Manitoba Department of Mines, Resources  
and Environmental Management  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

**A.R. Milne**  
Institute of Ocean Sciences &  
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans  
Sidney, B.C.

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.G. Connelly**

**The guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement have been finalized by the Panel and issued to the initiators for distribution to the proponents. The Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared and distributed to the Panel. Copies of the EIS have also been distributed to technical review agencies and the public strictly for information purposes.**

**Future Events**

**An alternate route, the "Y" line proposal, is being considered by Polar Gas. It would involve piping natural gas reserves from the Arctic Islands with those from the Mackenzie Delta and the Beaufort Sea to southern Canada. The review of the EIS for the "applied-for" route is in abeyance pending a decision by Polar Gas on route selection.**

**Panel Documents**

**Guidelines for preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the Polar Gas Project.**

**QUEBEC PORT EXPANSION**  
**(Creation of a Harbour and Industrial Zone)**

**Location**

Downstream from Quebec City, the left bank of the St. Lawrence below the mouth of the Saint-Charles River.

**Initiator**

National Harbours Board, Department of Transport.

Contact: Yvon Bureau, directeur de la gestion des propriétés  
10, rue de Quercy, P. O. Box 2268, Quebec (Quebec) B1K 7P7  
Tel. (418) 694-3568.

**Description**

Plans are to add 330 hectares of land during the next twenty years to the already developed 115 hectares partially reclaimed from the river previously; this new land would be gained by landfilling the left bank of the St. Lawrence River at the site known as the "Beauport wetlands". Fill would be taken from the St. Lawrence and Saint-Charles riverbeds. These lands will be developed into three parallel zones: harbour, industrial and mixed.

The harbour zone (180 hectares), about 400 meters deep, will be developed for the handling and storage of bulk solid products and general merchandise.

Parallel to this zone, an area of 100 hectares, varying from 200 to 450 meters in depth, will be set aside as an industrial zone for the establishment of various industries (metal products, chemical products, agro-food industry and so forth).

Finally, the mixed zone (48 hectares) will be developed between the existing residential zone and the planned industrial zone; it will provide a buffer (about 250 meters deep) between these two zones and be reserved for the use of office buildings, para-industrial activities and so forth. Estimated project cost: \$200 million (1977 dollars).

**Possible environmental Impacts**

1. Reduction of the width of the St Lawrence River by the placing of dredge materials on the left bank.
2. Degradation of the intertidal zone, St. Charles river mouth and various inlet environments caused by the landfill and dredging operations and by water pollution.
3. Effects on wildlife (riparian plantlife, benthic organisms and use of the shore and certain shallows by migratory birds) due to landfill works and the changes they will bring to the natural environment.

4. Degradation of the atmospheric environment caused by suspended solid emissions from the handling and outdoor storage of bulk materials and by industrial activities.
5. Conflict between the commercial and recreational use of neighbouring waters.
6. Visual pollution and the reduction of shoreline accessibility and use by riparian residents.

#### Status Under EARP

The project was submitted for Environmental Assessment panel review at the start of September 1978. The Panel was established and comprises the following members:

**F.G. Hurtubise**  
Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa  
(Chairman)

**Raymond Dufour**  
7053, Place Montclair  
Charlesbourg, Quebec  
G1H 5R1

**Vincent Lemieux**  
Département de science  
politique  
Pavillon de Koninck  
Université Laval  
G1K 7P4

**L. Ouimet**  
Conseil québécois des Loisirs  
2360, Chemin Ste Foy  
Ste-Foy, Quebec  
G1V 4H2

**Marcel Lortie**  
Environmental Management Service  
Environment Canada  
P.O. Box 10,000  
Ste-Foy, Que.

**Gabriel Filteau**  
Fisheries and Marine Service  
901, rue Cap Diamant  
Quebec, Que. G1K 7X7

**Fernand Tremblay**  
819, rue Mbreau  
Ste-Foy, Que G1V 3B5

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: Yvan Vigneault, 2700 Laurier Boulevard,  
Quebec, Quebec. G1V 4H5  
Tel. (418) 694-3921**

Public hearings were held at the end of November 1978 to review the proposed guidelines for preparing the environmental impact statement. The Panel has completed the final version of the guidelines and forwarded them to the National Harbours Board.

#### Future Events

As soon as the Panel receives the environmental impact statement, it will organize public meetings to hear all comments from people interested in this study.

#### Panel Documents

Guidelines for preparation of the environmental impact statement.

EXPANSION OF AIR TRAFFIC CAPACITY OF VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Location

Vancouver International Airport, Richmond, British Columbia.

Initiator

Federal Department of Transport (Canadian Air Transportation Administration)

Contact: Mr. C. Heed, Pacific Regional Manager, Airport Branch, Transport Canada, 739 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, B.C.

Description

Improvement to the aircraft handling capability of Vancouver International Airport, Sea Island, south of Vancouver, to provide for the demand projected by the initiator. The initiator's preferred alternative is the proposed construction of a parallel runway and related facilities inside the dyke at Vancouver International.

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Removal of land from agricultural use.
2. Reduction in the availability of the Sea Island area as habitat for migrating birds, resident birds and other wildlife.
3. Increase in aircraft noise and the resultant effect on wildlife and the surrounding residential areas of Vancouver and Richmond.

Status Under EARP

Project submitted to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in August 1976. Panel formed November 1976. Members are:

F.G. Hurtubise  
Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)

A.A. Bach  
Regional Administrator  
C.A.T.A., Airports  
Transport Canada  
Vancouver, B.C.

B.A. Heskin  
Regional Director  
Environmental Protection Service  
Environment Canada  
West Vancouver, B.C.

J.P. Sector, Head  
Environmental Services Section  
Environmental Studies Division  
British Columbia Ministry of the  
Environment  
Victoria, B.C.

**V. C. Brink  
Agronomist  
Vancouver, B. C.**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: P. F. Scott, FEARO,  
700-789 West Pender St.,  
Vancouver, B. C. V6C 1H2  
(604) 666-2431**

**Public hearings were held by the Panel in September 1977 to receive comments on draft Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines.**

**The guidelines were finalized by the Panel and issued to Transport Canada in July 1978. The guidelines are available to the public.**

#### **Future Events**

**Transport Canada will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement, based on the Guidelines and will submit that to the Panel for public review. Timing for the preparation of the EIS is uncertain.**

#### **Panel Documents**

**Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.**

**Written submissions to the Panel on the draft guidelines.**

**Transcript of public hearings on the draft guidelines (\$5.00).**

**SOUTH YUKON TRANSPORTATION STUDY**

**Location**

The study includes consideration of alternatives within the Yukon Territory principally between Whitehorse and Ross River with possible links to British Columbia, Alaska or the Northwest Territories.

**Initiator**

Federal Department of Transport

Contact: D.W. Bachynski, Railway Transportation Directorate, Transport Canada, 2760-200 Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1S4

**Description**

Improvement of transportation systems in the Yukon involving the study of several alternate railway and one road development strategies. The ultimate purpose of the project is to aid in the development of the natural resource potential of the Yukon. The alternates range in capital costs from \$35 million to \$370 million (1974 dollars).

**Possible Areas of Environmental Impact**

Not known at present

**Status Under EARP**

The project was referred for Panel review in October 1976. The Panel was formed in December 1976. Panel members are:

F. G. Hurtubise  
Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment  
Review Office  
Ottawa, Ontario  
(Chairman)

G. A. E. Jones  
Chief  
South Coast Division  
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans  
Vancouver, B. C.

C. E. Wykes  
Director, Yukon Branch  
Environmental Protection Service  
Environment Canada  
Whitehorse, Y. T.

M. Dennington  
Wildlife Advisor  
Canadian Wildlife Service  
Yukon Territory  
Environment Canada  
Whitehorse, Y. T.



**J. Hawryszko**  
**Senior Policy and Economic Advisor**  
**Arctic Transportation Agency**  
**Transport Canada**  
**Ottawa**

**W.A. Bilawich**  
**Special Projects Coordinator**  
**Government of Yukon**  
**P.O. Box 2703**  
**Whitehorse, Yukon**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: Mr. P.F. Scott, FEARO,**  
**700-789 West Pender St.,**  
**Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1H2**  
**(604) 666-2431**

**Guidelines to assist in the environmental analysis of alternatives have been prepared by the Panel and forwarded to Transport Canada. These are available to the public.**

#### **Future Events**

**When Transport Canada has completed the evaluation of alternatives and is ready to concentrate study on a specific proposal, the Panel will decide what further environmental investigation may be necessary. This first phase of study by Transport Canada is expected to last a number of years.**

#### **Panel Documents.**

**Guidelines for analysis of alternatives.**

**LIST OF REVIEWED PROJECTS UNDER**  
**THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW PROCESS**

1. Point Lepreau, New Brunswick  
Nuclear Power Station  
Report to the Minister, May 1975
2. Wreck Cove, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia  
Hydro Electric Power Project  
Report to the Minister, August 1976
3. Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline project, Yukon Territory  
Interim report to the Minister, August 1, 1977
4. Eldorado Nuclear Limited, Uranium Refinery, Port Granby, Ontario  
Report to the Minister, May 12, 1978
5. Shawkwak Highway Project, Northern B.C. and Yukon  
Report to the Minister, June 1978
6. Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling, South Davis Strait Project. N.W.T.  
Report to the Minister, November 1, 1978
7. Lancaster Sound Offshore Drilling Project, Northwest Territories  
Report to the Minister, February, 1979
8. Eldorado uranium hexafluoride refinery, Ontario  
Report to the Minister, February, 1979
9. Roberts Bank Port Expansion, Roberts Bank, B.C.  
Report to the Minister, March 1979
10. Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project. Yukon Public Hearings  
(March-April 1979)  
Report to the Minister, August 1979
11. Banff Highway Project (East Gate to km 13)  
Report to the Minister, October 1979

**1. POINT LEPREAU NB NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION**

**This project was referred to an Environmental Assessment Panel in June 1974 by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.**

**Considerable planning on this project had been carried out, before the Environmental Assessment and Review Process was established. In order to meet previously announced deadlines, the Panel received a preliminary Environmental Impact Statement and, in cooperation with New Brunswick officials, held public hearings in St. John, New Brunswick on the project during which over fifty briefs were received.**

**The Panel made its Report to the Minister of the Environment in May 1975. It concluded that the proposed nuclear generating station could be built at Point Lepreau without significant adverse environmental effects, provided a number of recommendations were followed. These included completion of a final EIS, to include aquatic data to be used in design of water inlet and outlet structures and data on the impact from the proposed freshwater supply facilities.**

**The Panel also recommended that a long term monitoring program be initiated and that a research program on short and long term effects of radioactive emissions be undertaken. It also recommended that a national policy for storage, disposal and reprocessing of radioactive waste be developed as soon as possible.**

**The final EIS was received in May 1977 and considered satisfactory following technical review.**

**The recommendations of the Panel were accepted by the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.**

## **2. WRECK COVE HYDRO ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT**

The hydroelectric power generating project involved the diversion of the head waters of seven rivers to the generating station at Wreck Cove on the east coast of the Island. The project area is located on the southern boundary of Cape Breton Highlands National Park. It was proposed to use part of the former Park lands in the Cheticamp Lake area, which were federal crown lands. Although parts of the project were already under construction, work in the Cheticamp section, where the major federal interest lay, was projected to start in 1977.

As a result of an agreement between the federal and provincial Environment Ministers, the project became a Panel candidate in March 1975. Given that the construction of the project had been approved by the Nova Scotia Government subject to a phased environmental assessment, the agreement specified that the focus of the EIS was to be on a phased study related to the project's proposed construction phases. The EIS study was to concentrate primarily on consideration of alternatives for the Cheticamp area and their environmental impacts, in addition to an overall assessment of the project stages already well advanced, where the emphasis would be on the design of adequate mitigation measures.

The Environmental Impact Statement guidelines produced by a federal-provincial Task Force were approved and issued by the Panel to Nova Scotia Power Corporation, September 1975. An interim statement was received by the Panel in May 1976. A public meeting to review the statement and for presentation of briefs was held at Baddeck, Cape Breton Island, in July 1976. This was co-chaired by the federal Panel and the provincial Department of the Environment. Minutes and answers to questions raised by the public at the Baddeck meeting have been made publicly available by the Nova Scotia Department of the Environment.

A Panel Interim Report was presented to the Minister in August 1976. It concluded that the interim EIS had major deficiencies and recommended that construction affecting the Cheticamp area not proceed until more information was provided.

The final impact statement was distributed in May, 1977. After review by the public and the Panel in May-June, 1977, the Panel reported to the federal Minister of the Environment in July, 1977. It concluded that the Cheticamp portion of the project might be constructed and operated with acceptable environmental impact provided that a number of recommendations in the report were implemented.

The Report was accepted by the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs.

3. ALASKA HIGHWAY GAS PIPELINE  
INTERIM REPORT - JULY 27, 1977

The Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline project, proposed by Foothills Pipeline (Yukon) Ltd., roughly parallels the Alaska Highway from Beaver Creek, Yukon to Watson Lake, a distance of about 800 km. It involves the construction of a 1.2 m buried gas transmission pipeline to carry natural gas from Alaska to the lower 48 States.

Because the project required right-of-way through federally administered lands in Yukon and could cause significant environmental damage, it was referred by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs for Panel review on March 27, 1977. At the same time, it was required that the Panel file an interim report by August 1, 1977 for use by the Minister and Cabinet in decisions on this project. This necessitated a significant departure from procedures normally followed. On the understanding that such a report would be regarded as preliminary, to be later followed by a formal Panel review, the usual guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement were not issued. Instead, the Panel was instructed to review existing data as supplied by the proponent, and other sources.

The Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs also appointed a Board of Inquiry under the Chairmanship of Dean K. Lysyk to identify and report on socio-economic impacts. The Panel, therefore examined only those socio-economic impacts that directly affected or were affected by environmental factors.

The interim report was presented by the Panel to the Minister of Environment on July 27, 1977. The report was accepted by the Minister of the Environment and by his colleague, the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs.

4. ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED - EXPANSION OF URANIUM REFINING CAPACITY  
PORT GRANBY, ONTARIO

The proposed project by Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. involved the construction of a uranium refinery with a capacity of 9,000 metric tons natural uranium in the form of uranium hexafluoride (UF<sub>6</sub>). The refinery would process ore concentrates (yellowcake) primarily from mines located in Ontario to produce uranium hexafluoride for United States and overseas market.

The Panel submitted its report to the Minister of the Environment, on May 12, 1978. The report stated that the refinery and plant processes were environmentally acceptable if certain conditions could be met. While the refinery would provide a net economic benefit to Canada, however, the Panel could perceive little economic or social benefit to the local community. Of greatest importance to the Panel, however, was the unacceptable precedent of locating the facility on what is some of the best agricultural land in Ontario and in an area where the long-term character is essentially rural and based on an agricultural lifestyle. At the same time, the Panel found the waste management system as proposed by Eldorado to be unsuitable for the storage of refinery wastes. In its conclusion, the Panel recommended that the facility be located in an existing industrial area provided that the waste management problems could be solved.

The Minister of the Environment endorsed the recommendations made by the Panel.

5. SHAKWAK PROJECT (HAINES ROAD/ALASKA HIGHWAY)

**This project involves the reconstruction and paving of that portion of the Alaska Highway from the Alaska/Yukon border to Haines Junction in the Yukon, and the Haines Road from Haines Junction to the B.C./Alaska border. Existing alignments will be used for the major portion of the project. The project is being financed by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highways Administration, and will be constructed by Public Works Canada.**

**The request for a Panel was received July, 1974, and the Panel was formed March, 1975.**

**Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were issued by the Panel in May, 1976. The EIS was prepared by Public Works Canada and submitted to the Panel in January, 1978. The EIS was widely distributed for public and government review in Canada and at the same time was also reviewed in the United States.**

**Public hearings were held by the Panel in Whitehorse and communities along the project corridor in March, 1978.**

**The Panel report containing its recommendations on the project was submitted to the Minister of the Environment in June, 1978. In its report, the Panel concluded that it will be possible to carry out the project without significant adverse environmental or social impacts if appropriate procedures are followed and certain conditions are met. The report and its recommendations were accepted by the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Public Works. Construction is now under way and is expected to take a number of years to complete.**

**In accordance with the Panel's recommendations, an Environmental Review Committee has been established to monitor the design and construction activities and report annually to the Minister of the Environment and to the Yukon Territorial Government.**

6. EASTERN ARCTIC OFFSHORE DRILLING  
SOUTH DAVIS STRAIT PROJECT

In the summer of 1976, a consortium of oil companies composed of Imperial Oil Limited (effective September 1, 1978, Imperial Oil Limited transferred its interests in this project to ESSO Resources Canada Limited), Aquitaine Company of Canada Limited, and Canada-Cities Service Limited presented a proposal to conduct exploratory offshore drilling programs to test the sedimentary basin of southern Davis Strait for hydrocarbons.

Drilling would take place during open water seasons in water depths ranging to 6,000 feet, utilizing dynamically-positioned drill ships or semi-submersible platforms.

The Panel requested and received relevant information from a variety of sources. Public meetings were held at various communities on the southern part of Baffin Island and in Frobisher Bay to provide an opportunity for the residents to express their views about the proposed project.

The Panel related the probability associated with a major oil well blowout against the impact it might have as a measure of the environmental risk of the project.

In its report to the Minister of the Environment, the Panel recommends that the project be allowed to proceed as proposed, only if the following conditions meet the satisfaction of the relevant regulatory agencies:

- a) The Proponent's detailed oil spill contingency plan be developed and in place, six months prior to the commencement of drilling. The effectiveness of the plan in carrying out control and clean-up response action for an oil well blowout should be demonstrated prior to the commencement of the drilling operation.
- b) A government contingency plan be developed and in place prior to drilling that would delineate the responsibilities of all government agencies when oil spills occur in the Davis Strait area.
- c) The Proponent is able to provide same-season relief well capability.
- d) Liability and compensation provisions under existing regulations be examined by responsible regulatory authorities to ensure their adequacy under current circumstances.
- e) The Proponent continue to carry out adequate information programs in order to explain the progress of the drilling program to the residents of south Baffin Island.

The Minister of the Environment endorsed the Panel's recommendations.



## **7. LANCASTER SOUND DRILLING**

In 1977, Norlands Petroleum Limited proposed to drill a single expendable exploratory well during the open water season to obtain stratigraphic information which might determine any hydrocarbon potential. Drilling would take place in approximately 770 metres of water utilizing a dynamically positioned drill ship.

The Panel requested and received information from a variety of sources. Hearings were held in the communities of Arctic Bay, Resolute Bay, Grise Fiord, and Pond Inlet for the purpose of providing an opportunity for the residents to express their views about the proposed project to the Panel. Two phases of general hearings took place in October and November, 1978 in Pond Inlet, where a more structured set of procedures was pursued to hear written and oral briefs presented to the Panel.

The Panel assessed the future and prospective uses of Lancaster Sound as well as the Proponent's proposal; the Panel concluded that a meaningful assessment of exploratory drilling in Lancaster Sound would not be made in isolation from the broader issues that affect all uses of the area.

The Panel considered potential impacts ranging from the physical and biological to the socio-economic. The ultimate conclusion of the Panel was that the Proponent was not sufficiently prepared to undertake the proposed drilling in a safe manner and with minimum risk to the environment. Accordingly, the Panel recommended that exploratory drilling of the Dundas K-56 be deferred until such time as

- a) the government has addressed the issue of the best use(s) of Lancaster Sound.
- b) the Proponent has demonstrated both a capability to deal safely and effectively with the physical hazards in Lancaster Sound and operational preparedness to mitigate the effects of a blowout.

In addition, the Panel outlined a number of specific conditions that the Proponent, or any other prospective company, must meet, if and when drilling operations are allowed to proceed in Lancaster Sound.

The Panel also addressed the request for regional environmental clearance of Lancaster Sound and concluded such clearance would be premature, based upon the information contained in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the results of the review.

**8. ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED - EXPANSION OF URANIUM REFINING CAPACITY**  
**ONTARIO**

On July 27, 1978, Eldorado notified the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office that it planned to submit for review an environmental impact statement on each of three possible locations for the Company's proposed Ontario uranium refinery with a capacity of 9,000 metric tons uranium in the form of uranium hexafluoride (UF<sub>6</sub>). The refinery would process ore concentrates (yellowcake) primarily from mines located in Ontario to produce uranium hexafluoride for United States and overseas markets. The three sites proposed were in the Blind River, Port Hope and Sudbury regions.

The Panel report was submitted to the Minister of the Environment on February 23, 1979.

The Panel's review led to the conclusion that all three sites were acceptable for the project if certain conditions were met. In finding the refinery and its processes acceptable, the Panel recommended adherence by Eldorado to specific conditions regardless of the plant location.

The Panel agreed that the proposed design for the refinery would be capable of meeting government requirements concerning air emissions and water discharges. The Panel, however, felt that further investigation should be conducted to improve the detection of spills affecting the wastewater systems and the resulting design improvements incorporated in the Safety Report required by the Atomic Energy Control Board.

The Panel felt that during start-up a more extensive monitoring program should be conducted followed by normal or routine monitoring during plant operations. Further, a monitoring program for contingencies and a monitoring plan for decommissioning are recommended.

The Panel also felt that Eldorado should introduce a comprehensive occupational health monitoring system which would include provision for post-employment follow-up to aid in the detection of any future health trends.

The Panel accepted that precautions taken to ensure transportation accident risks associated with the refinery would be no greater than for other industrial activities.

As a further condition for proceeding, the Panel recommended that Eldorado produce detailed plans for plant decommissioning upon completion of its operation as part of its licensing applications. The panel also recommended a number of conditions which were site-specific.

The Minister of the Environment endorsed the recommendations made by the Panel.

## **9. ROBERTS BANK PORT EXPANSION**

The present Roberts Bank Port facility consists of a 20 hectare coal port terminal at the end of a 5 km causeway. The facility is located in Delta, about 30 km south of Vancouver. The project, proposed by the National Harbours Board (NHB) calls for the construction of up to 110 hectares of additional terminal space for the export of bulk commodities such as coal, sulphur, potash, grain and bulk liquids.

The project was referred for a Panel review in May, 1975.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) guidelines were issued by the Panel in March, 1976 and the completed EIS was received from the NHB in November, 1977. The EIS was reviewed by the Panel, government agencies and the public. Following this review, the Panel issued to the NHB a list of deficiencies in the EIS. The NHB's response to this deficiency list was received in June, 1978.

The final stage of the Panel review involved the holding of public hearings in the period October 24 to November 2, 1978.

Following the hearings, the Panel report was prepared and submitted to the Minister of the Environment in March, 1979. The report recommends against the full scale expansion on the basis of unacceptable impacts on the estuarine ecology and the potential for adverse social impacts. The panel concluded, however, that the ecological impacts would be minimal and other impacts could be reasonably mitigated if port expansion were limited to no more than two terminals occupying a maximum of 40 hectares. If it is decided to proceed with the limited expansion, the Panel has recommended that the NHB undertake a number of environmental design studies.

The Minister of the Environment has endorsed the Panel's key findings and the Panel's recommendations have been forwarded to the Minister of Transport.

10. ALASKA HIGHWAY GAS PIPELINE PROJECT  
Yukon Public Hearings (March-April 1979)

The Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project, a proposal by Foothills Pipe Lines (South Yukon) Limited, involves the construction of a large-diameter, buried, gas transmission pipeline and ancillary structures in southern Yukon. The pipeline is part of a larger system intended to carry natural gas from Alaska to the lower 48 States. The Canadian portion of the system would pass through Yukon, British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

The proposed route is approximately 818 km long and parallels the Alaska Highway from Beaver Creek (Yukon-Alaska border) in the north, to Watson Lake (Yukon-British Columbia border) in the south.

It is proposed that the most northerly 46 km of the Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline in Yukon will carry gas chilled below 0° C.

The project was referred to the Minister of the Environment by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs on March 21, 1977 for an assessment of the environmental impact. Shortly thereafter, an Environmental Assessment Panel was established.

Because of major decisions facing government on competing pipeline proposals in the fall of 1977, the Panel was not able to undertake a normal review of the environmental implications of the project at that time. Instead, the Panel reviewed existing data, sought public and professional opinion through hearings held in Yukon and submitted an Interim Report on July 27, 1977. It was understood that, if the Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project was still a contender after decisions on competing proposals were made, the formal environmental assessment and review procedure would apply.

In its Interim Report, the Panel concluded that "the proposed pipeline can be constructed and operated in an environmentally acceptable manner" subject to certain specified conditions related to environmental planning, routing around sensitive areas and development of mitigative measures to solve environmental problems associated with ice-rich permafrost. It was noted that an elevated mode, which was not addressed at the hearings, might provide an alternative to burying a pipeline in ice-rich permafrost areas. Furthermore, the Panel recommended that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Yukon pipeline route be completed based upon guidelines to be issued by the Panel.

In September, 1977, the Governments of Canada and the United States of America decided to proceed with the project. Following this decision by government to authorize construction of the pipeline, the Panel issued in December, 1977, Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. These Guidelines were submitted to Foothills Pipe Lines (South

**Yukon) Limited. The Guidelines specified that the organization, content and completeness of the EIS are the responsibility of the Proponent. Furthermore, in preparing the EIS, the Proponent was asked to take into consideration the information deficiencies identified during the hearings and in the 1977 Interim Report to the Minister of the Environment.**

**In late 1978, the Initiating Department role for this project was transferred from the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to the Northern Pipeline Agency as a result of the transfer of regulatory responsibilities. In January, 1979, the EIS was submitted by the Proponent to the Environmental Assessment Panel.**

**In accordance with the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process, the Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Environmental Assessment Panel has reviewed the proposal made by Foothills Pipe Lines (South Yukon) Limited.**

**The Panel examined the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and supporting documents submitted by the Proponent, received and reviewed many briefs and comments from the public and from government review agencies, in the course of public hearings held in Yukon communities. Even though a great deal of vital and useful information was brought before the Panel, the Panel was unable to complete the review of the project because important information was missing on engineering design, and environmental and natural resource issues. The report outlined these information deficiencies and the Panel recommended that the Proponent prepare a revised Environmental Impact Statement taking into account the contents of the report. Public hearings under the Environmental Assessment and Review Process will be reconvened once the Proponent has submitted this documentation. The report was presented by the Panel to the Minister of the Environment in August 1979.**

**11. BANFF HIGHWAY PROJECT**  
**(East Gate to km 13)**

**A proposal by Public Works Canada to upgrade 13 kilometres of the Trans-Canada Highway (TCH) in Banff National Park to provide a four-lane, limited access, divided highway was referred by Public Works to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in May, 1978.**

**The proposed twinning starts at the Park's East Gate (km 0) and would parallel and incorporate the existing two-lane highway, terminating at km 13 just before the Banff townsite traffic circle. In February 1979, Public Works issued an Environmental Impact Statement for the twinning of the TCH from km 0 to km 13. The Panel solicited comments from the public and from technical agencies and, in June 1979, held public meetings in Calgary and Banff. After carefully considering the information presented, the Panel reached a number of conclusions and has formulated certain recommendations which are contained in its report.**

**During deliberations the Panel considered issues such as the need for the project, possible alternatives, the environmental impact of the project, park planning and social considerations. In addition the question of responsibility for mitigation measures was examined.**

**The Panel concluded that the need for additional highway capacity had been clearly demonstrated and there were no viable alternatives that would reduce environmental impacts compared to the proposed project.**

**The Panel agreed with the many intervenors who identified present traffic constraints on the TCH, such as the traffic circle and the East Gate, and has made recommendations for improvements. The question of energy conservation was examined and recommendations on use of public transportation and posted speed limits have also been made.**

**The conclusion of the Panel is that the project can be constructed and operated with acceptable environmental disturbance and no significant residual environmental impact.**

**As a condition to proceeding, recommendations have been made by the Panel concerning mitigation of specific impacts. The more important of these include under/overpasses and fences to eliminate ungulate kills on the highway, requirements to enhance fisheries habitat, mitigation measures for sensitive terrain and vegetation, and procedures to ensure that an aesthetically pleasing highway is constructed. The Panel made recommendations covering the coordination and implementation measures necessary during design and construction. Further recommendations were also made for consideration by appropriate authorities.**

With regard to planning and social issues the Panel concluded that the proposal is compatible with Park plans and policies as well as those of other jurisdictions. It is considered that the proposed project and associated construction activities will not cause significant negative social impacts.

The Panel noted that an opportunity exists to build this section of the TCH with minimum environmental damage and maximization of the visual resource so as to produce a Canadian example of design excellence and recommended that twinning of km 0 to 13 be allowed to proceed provided the conditions contained in its report are met. The Minister of the Environment endorsed the recommendations made by the Panel (October 1979).

**GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE**

**Staff Changes**

**Mr. F.G. Hurtubise, Executive Chairman, Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, is pleased to announce the following appointments:**

- Mr. John F. Herity, formerly Manager of FEARO's Vancouver Office, has been appointed Director General, Process Development and Evaluation Directorate. He replaces Mr. Wally Tait who has retired from the Public Service.**
- Dr. Patrick J.B. Duffy has been appointed Director of Operations with primary responsibility for the prairie and northern areas.**
- Mr. Philip J. Paradine has been appointed Director of Operations with primary responsibility for the Atlantic area.**
- Mr. Robert G. Connelly has been appointed Director of Operations with primary responsibility for the central Canada area.**
- Mr. David W. Marshall has been appointed Director of Operations, Pacific Region, effective January 1, 1980. He will be initially located in Hull and relocated to the Vancouver FEARO office later in 1980. Mr. Marshall was formerly with the Environmental Protection Service of Environment Canada.**
- Mr. Paul F. Scott, Executive Secretary Pacific Region, will act as Director, Pacific Region until Mr. Marshall relocates to Vancouver.**
- Mr. Paul G. Wolf has been appointed Director, Process Development.**
- Mr. William J. Couch has been appointed Analyst, Process evaluation and review.**
- Mr. Douglas Parkinson has been seconded to FEARO as a Public Participation Officer, from the National Parole Board.**
- Mrs. Suzanne Latour has been appointed Administrative Officer.**



**Administration and Staff**

**The Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office is administered by a permanent Executive Chairman appointed by the Minister of the Environment. The present Executive Chairman is Mr. F.G. Hurtubise.**

**Other members of the staff of the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in Ottawa are listed below:**

<b><u>NAME &amp; TITLE</u></b>	<b><u>GENERAL DUTIES</u></b>
<b>Mr. J.S. Klenavic Associate Executive Chairman</b>	<b>Chairman of Panels Responsible for panel operations Develops public participation plans Implements operational policy and procedures</b>
<b>Dr. Patrick J.B. Duffy</b>	<b>Director Operations Chairman of Panels Executive Secretary to panels.</b>
<b>Mr. R.G. Connelly</b>	<b>Director Operations Executive Secretary to panels.</b>
<b>Mr. P.J. Paradine</b>	<b>Director Operations Executive Secretary to panels.</b>
<b>Mr. Yvan Vigneault</b>	<b>Executive Secretary to the "Port of Quebec Expansion" panel.</b>
<b>Mr. J.M. Thomas</b>	<b>Manager, publications</b>
<b>Mr. J.F. Herity, Director General, Process Development and Evaluation Directorate</b>	<b>EARP policy coordination and evaluation Liaison and coordination with federal departments and agencies</b>
<b>Mr. Paul G. Wolf</b>	<b>Director, Process Development</b>
<b>Mr. J.G. Gainer</b>	<b>Analyst, Process development</b>
<b>Mr. C.D. Robertson</b>	<b>A/Director, Process Evaluation and Coordination Branch</b>
<b>Dr. W.J. Couch</b>	<b>Analyst, Process evaluation and review</b>

**Vancouver Regional Office**

**Mr. P. F. Scott**

**A/Director, Operations**

**For information concerning the Environmental Assessment and Review Process  
or specific Panel projects, contact:**

**Office of the Executive Chairman  
Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office  
Department of Environment  
Ottawa K1A 0H3**

**Telephone: (819) 997-1000**

**or: P. F. Scott**

**A/Director, Pacific Region  
Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office  
700-789 West Pender St.  
Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1H2**

**Telephone: (604) 666-2431**

Publications

The following publications are available from the following offices:

**Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office**  
**13th Floor, Fontaine Building**  
**200 Sacré Coeur Boulevard**  
**Hull, Quebec**  
**K1A 0H3**

**Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office**  
**1870 - 1050 West Pender Street**  
**Vancouver, B. C.**  
**V6E 3S7**

1. "A Revised Guide to the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process"
2. "Register of Panel Projects and Bulletin." (Quarterly. For placement on the mailing list for the Register please write to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, Fontaine Building, 200 Sacré Coeur Boulevard, Hull, P.Q. K1A 0H3)
3. "Guidelines for preparing Initial Environmental Evaluations"
4. "A Guide for Environmental Screening"
5. Guidelines for the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements prepared by the Panels for the panel projects.
6. Panel reports to the Minister of the Environment on the Panel Projects (see page 38).