

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
SEPTEMBER, 1980**

NEW ITEMS IN THIS EDITION

Referrals - New Projects

1 - Beaufort Sea Hydrocarbon Development 13

Reports Released

Report Number 13 Eldorado Nuclear Ltd
Expansion of Uranium Refinery Capacity (Saskatchewan)..... 58

Departure of Executive Chairman

New appointment for Mr. F.G. Hurtubise 59

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS: BRIEF SUMMARY	2
INFORMATION ON PANEL PROJECTS	
Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project.....	4
Arctic Pilot Project.....	7
Banff National Park Highway Project.....	9
Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Generation Project.....	11
Beaufort Sea Hydrocarbon Development.....	13
Dempster Pipeline Project.....	14
Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling . North Davis Strait Project.....	16
Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. . Expansion of Uranium Refinery Capacity.....	18
Fraser River Shipping Channel	20
Grand Banks . Possible Oil Production.....	22
Lower Churchill Hydro Electric Project.....	24
Mackenzie Delta Gas Gathering System.....	27
Norman Wells Oil Field Development and Pipeline.....	29
Polar Gas Project. * . * . . . *	31
Quebec Port Expansion Project.....	33
Shoal Lake Cottage Lot Development.....	35
Slave River Hydro Project.....	37
South Yukon Transportation Study.....	39
Vancouver International Airport - Expansion of Air Traffic Capacity.....	41
LIST OF REVIEWED PANEL PROJECTS	43
Point Lepreau NB Nuclear Generating Station.....	44
Wreck Cove Hydro Electric Power Project.....	45
Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline - Interim Report July 27, 1977.....	46

Eldorado Nuclear Limited - Expansion of Uranium Refining Capacity - Port Granby, Ontario.....	47
Shakwak Project (Haines Road/Alaska Highway)	48
Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling - South Davis Strait Project.....*	49
Lancaster Sound Drilling Project.....	50
Eldorado Nuclear Limited - Expansion of Uranium Refining Capacity - Ontario.....	51
Roberts Bank Port Expansion.....	52
Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project - Yukon Public Hearings.....	53
Banff Highway Project.....	55
Boundary Bay Airport Reactivation.....	57
Eldorado Uranium Refinery, R. M. of Corman Park, Saskatchewan.....	58
 GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE	
Administration and Staff.....	59
Publications.....	61

INTRODUCTION

This publication provides 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 following offices:

Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Office
13th Floor, Fontaine Bldg., Hull, Québec
Mailing address: FEARO, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3
and
Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Office
700 - 789 West Pender Street
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6C 1H2

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:

J. S. Klenavic
A/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, Quebec (819) 9974000
Mailing address: FEARO, Ottawa, K1A 0H3

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, Davis Strait and an Eastern Canada Port.

Initiator

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

Contact: W. Mills, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Hull, Quebec
Mailing address: DINA, Ottawa, 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 Inlet capable of year around operation, and two 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 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 circulated to government agencies for review. The Panel received comments on the Environmental Statement in May 1979. 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 submissions received from government agencies were included in this document. Guidelines for Completion of the Environmental Assessment were issued in September 1979.

In response to the guidelines, Petro-Canada issued supplementary information to their Environmental Statement on November 30, 1979. This information, along with a socio-economic statement on the project was distributed in December 1979. Comments on the supplementary information and the socio-economic statement were issued in March, 1980.

Community meetings involving the Panel and Petro-Canada officials were held in Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Grise Fiord and Resolute Bay. General public meetings followed in Resolute Bay from April 23-29.

As part of the overall review of this project, the Panel will be holding joint Federal/Provincial public meetings in Eastern Canada on the subject of the receiving terminal and the shipping approaches to it.

Panel members are:

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

D.W.I. Marshall
Federal Environmental
Assessment Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Vice Chairman)

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

D.N. Bissett
Northern Pipelines Branch
Department of Indian and Northern
Affairs
Ottawa, Ontario

M.O. Berry
Applications and Impacts Division
Atmospheric Environment Service
Environment Canada
Downsview, Ontario

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

Rod Morrison
Government of the Northwest
Territories
Yellowknife, NWT

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.G. Connelly

Future Events

Panel deliberations are underway. A report will be prepared later this year for the Minister of Environment.

Panel Documents

1. Draft Guidelines for the Completion of the Environmental Assessment and Submissions on the Petro-Canada Environmental Statement (June 1979).
2. Comments presented to the Environmental Assessment Panel on the Draft Guidelines for the Completion of the Environmental Assessment for the Arctic Pilot Project (September 1979).
3. Guidelines for the Completion of the Environmental Assessment for the Arctic Pilot Project (September 1979).
4. Compendium of Briefs presented to the Arctic Pilot Project Environmental Assessment Panel (March 1980).

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. (See page 53).

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, 9974108

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.

Phil Paradine
A/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.

BEAUFORT SEA HYDROCARBON DEVELOPMENT

Location

Beaufort Sea

Proponent

Dome Petroleum Limited and others currently involved in the Beaufort Sea.

Initiator

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (DINA)

**Contact: Mr. W Mills, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Hull, Quebec.
Mailing address: DINA, Ottawa, K1A 0H3**

Description

Possible oil and gas production from the Beaufort Sea and subsequent transportation to southern markets via ice-breaker tanker through the Northwest Passage and/or an overland pipeline route. The proposal under review is still at the concept stage with project specific details such as location of development fields, development methods, tanker routes and tanker design, pipeline routes and details of ancillary and support facilities yet to be decided upon.

Possible Environmental Impacts

Due to the large size and wide scope of the development proposal under review, the impacts of the Beaufort Sea development potentially encompass a very wide variety of issues. The most severe ecological impacts will likely result from a major oil spill caused by an uncontrolled well blowout, tanker accident, ruptured pipeline or ruptured storage tank. The potential for socio-economic disruption will be a major focus of the review.

Status Under EARP

The project was referred for a Panel review on July 22, 1980. The Panel has yet to be formed with the exception of the appointment of the Panel Chairman who is:

**Mr. J.S. Klenavic
Acting Executive Chairman
Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario**

**The Executive Secretary to the Panel is: Mr. D.W.I. Marshall
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
700-789 West Pender Street
Vancouver, B.C.
V6C 1M2 (604) 666-2431**

Future Events

Announcements on the Panel members will be made in the near future.

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: O. Løken, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Hull, Quebec
Mailing address: DINA, 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.

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

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

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.L. Greyell, FEARO,
13th Floor, Fontaine Bldg.,
Hull, Quebec (819) 9974000
Mailing address: FEARO, Ottawa, Ont.
K1A 0H3

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 heave 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 Chaudière, Hull, Quebec
Mailing address: DINA, 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:

**R. G. Connelly
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. Morrison
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. L. Greyell.

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. Public meetings were held as follows: 8, 9, 10 January, Martensville, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 January, Saskatoon, and 21, 22, 23, 24 January, Martensville. The Panel report was issued to the Minister of Environment in July 1980 and made public on August 6. (See page 58).

The Panel was formed in October 1979 and members are:

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

Allan Olmsted
Dept. of Sociology
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta

D. A. Rennie
Dept. of Soil Science
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

R. G. Beck
Dept. of Economic & Political
Science
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Reg. S. Lang
Faculty of Environmental Studies
York University
Toronto, Ontario

D. P. Scott
Freshwater Institute
Fisheries & Oceans Canada
501 University Crescent
Winnipeg, Manitoba

K. Shikaze
A/Director
Environmental Protection Service
Environment Canada
Toronto, Ontario

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R. G. Connelly

Panel Documents

Guidelines for an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Impact Statement (July 1979).

Transcript of the proceedings of an information meeting held with
Dr. David Schroeder, Oct. 25, 1979, Saskatoon.

Transcripts of the proceedings of the Environmental Assessment Panel
Public Meetings, January 1980.

Presentations to the Environmental Assessment Panel (July 1980)

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. The 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. The original proposal called for sufficient training works to be installed to provide a maximum 40' draft. Recent cost-benefit studies have indicated that this proposal is not economically viable at this time and a reduced scheme providing for a somewhat shallower draft is now under consideration.

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Changes in flow patterns, velocities, flushing rates, salinity patterns and water levels.
2. Changes in water quality.
3. Impacts on fish populations - fluctuations in area of available productive habitat, deterrents to migratory adult salmon, premature exposure of juvenile salmon to salt water.
4. Changes in aquatic and marsh flora and invertebrates including variation in area of production habitat in back waters and mudflats.
5. Impacts on bird populations, particularly in terms of changes in quality of habitat and loss of habitat.
6. Changes in recreational opportunities.
7. Induced socio-economic impacts.

Status Under EARP

Panel formed July 1976. Members are:

D.W.I. Marshall
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.

J. P. Selter, Manager
Evaluation Section, Assessment Br.
Assessment & Planning Division
British Columbia Ministry of
Environment
Victoria, B.C.

J.W. Wilson
Department of Geography
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, B.C.

S.O. Russell
Department of Civil Engineering
University of British Columbia
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

Guidelines for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the original proposal have been issued by the Panel. Public Works Canada, through a consultant, has almost completed the EIS for the full scheme.

Future Events

The full scheme EIS is expected to be submitted to the Panel in the Fall of 1980 along with an outline of the partial scheme proposal. This material will be made available to the public. The Panel will then prepare new guidelines for the completion of an EIS for the partial scheme. Public input will be solicited in the preparation of these new guidelines.

Panel Documents

Guidelines for the preparation of the EIS for the full scheme.
Initial Environmental Evaluation prepared by Public Works Canada.

Hyberia?

POSSIBLE OIL PRODUCTION ON THE NORTHEAST GRAND BANKS

Location

Northeast Grand Banks, east of Newfoundland.

Proponent

Mobil Oil of Canada Ltd.

Initiator

Federal Department of Energy, Mines & Resources

Description

Possible oil production on the northeast Grand Banks. (Mobil Oil of Canada Ltd. is currently carrying out exploration drilling for hydrocarbons at the Hibernia and Ben Nevis wells.)

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Potential effect on fisheries resource from oil spills, etc.
2. Potential effect on fisheries industry due to restrictions in fishing areas, debris, etc.
3. Socio-economic disruption.

Status under EARP

Panel partially formed in May 1980. Members appointed are:

Philip J. Paradine
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

Alfred W.H. Needler
Former Deputy Minister of Fisheries
St. Andrews, New Brunswick

G. Ross Peters
Associate Dean of Engineering
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland

Executive Secretary to the Panel: Guy Riverin
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3
(819) 9974000

Draft guidelines have been made available by the Panel for public review. Written comments were requested by June 16, 1980. After review of the comments received on the Draft guidelines, the Panel has now issued final guidelines to Mbil Oil for their use in the preparation of an EIS.

Future Events

Further announcement on Panel members will be made in the near future. Upon receipt of the EIS (probably in the fall 1980) public and technical agency comments will be sought on the project and the EIS itself, prior to public meetings in 1981.

Panel Documents

Draft guidelines.

Compendium of comments submitted to the Panel on the draft guidelines.

Final guidelines.

LOWER CHURCHILL HYDRO ELECTRIC 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: 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:

P.J. Paradine
Director Panel Operations
Atlantic Area
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

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

J.H.C. Pippy, Program Head
Freshwater and Anadromous Fisheries
Management
Research and Resource
Services Directorate
Department of Fisheries & Oceans
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
Executive Director
St. John's Hospital Council
St. John's, Newfoundland

André Ducharme
Head, Stream Alteration Unit
Resource Branch
Department of Fisheries & Oceans
St. John's, Newfoundland

Executive Secretary to the Panel: Guy Riverin
Mailing address: FEARO, Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3
(819) 997-1000

The review of the EIS's on the proposed generation facilities at Muskrat Falls and Gull Island as well as on the transmission line from Churchill Falls to St. John's has been completed. Comments by technical agencies and the public were reviewed by the Panel and made public. Public meetings will be held in September.

Future Events

Public meetings on both the transmission line and the generation sites will take place in communities along the route of the transmission line. They will begin in St. John's on September 2 and end in Goose Bay, Labrador on September 12.

Panel Documents

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

E.I.S. Transmission Line.

E.I.S. Power Generation Sites

Comments submitted to the Panel on the EIS - Power Generation Sites.

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 Chaudière, Hull, Quebec

Mailing address: DINA, 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. Morrison
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: R. L. Greyell, FEARO, 13th Floor,
Fontaine Bldg. Hill, Quebec
(819) 9974000
Mailing address: FEARO, Ottawa, Ont.
K1A 0H3

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.

NORMAN WELLS OIL FIELD DEVELOPMENT AND PIPELINE

Location

Norman Wells, Northwest Territories and the Mackenzie River Valley south to the Alberta border.

Proponents

Esso Resources Limited and Interprovincial Pipelines Limited

Initiator:

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

Contact: W.D. Mills, Northern Pipeline Branch, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Hull, Quebec
Mailing address: Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H4

Description

The proposed project includes development of the present Norman Wells oilfield and pipeline construction and operation over a right-of-way enroute to the Zama Lake area in Alberta. A 12-inch diameter oil pipeline is planned.

Possible Environmental and Social Impacts

- Siltation effects and disturbance of fish habitats and fish migration.
- Displacement of wildlife species.
- Permafrost degradation, subsidence and possible pipeline rupture.
- Disturbance of traditional land use patterns, cultural activities and historic/archaeological sites.
- Effects of large temporary work force and construction camps on community health and social issues.
- Effects of artificial production islands on Mackenzie River regime including ice-jamming and scouring implications.
- Positive and negative effects on local community economies, including business opportunities and employment.

Status under EARP

The project was referred by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in February, 1980. Based on FEARO guidelines issued for other projects, the proponents submitted their Environmental Impact Statement for Norman Wells in April, 1980. In July, 1980, the Panel issued a Compendium with technical reviewer comments on the EIS plus a Panel request for additional information. In August, additional review comments and Panel questions were distributed. Public Meetings were held August 11 to 25 in Mackenzie Valley and northern communities with Technical Meetings in Yellowknife, August 25 to 29.

The Panel was formed in May 1980. Panel members are:

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

**J. Alan Heginbottom
Terrain Sciences Division
Geological Survey of Canada
Energy, Mines and Resources
Ottawa, Ontario**

**Wayne Bryant
Director
Northwest Territories District
Environmental Protection Service
Environment Canada
Yellowknife, N.W.T.**

**John Stayer
Associate Dean of Arts
Faculty of Arts and Science
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B.C.**

**Art Look
Fort Providence, N.W.T.**

**Executive Secretary to the Panel: R. L. Greyell
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3
(819) 997-1000**

Future Events

It is expected that the Panel will report its findings to the Minister of the Environment in late November, 1980.

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, Hull, Quebec
Mailing address: DINA, 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.

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

Norman B. Brandson
Manitoba Department of Consumer and
Corporate Affairs and Environment
Environmental Management Division
Box 7, Building 2
139 Tuxedo Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

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.

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. Polar Gas will submit an EIS for this proposal in mid 1981.

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, Québec (Québec) 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, Québec
G1H 5R1

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

L. Ouinet
Conseil québécois des Loisirs
2360, Chemin Ste Foy
Ste-Foy, Québec
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
Québec, Que. G1K 7X7

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: **Yvan Vigneault**, 2700 Laurier Boulevard,
Québec, Québec. 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.

SHOAL LAKE COTTAGE LOT DEVELOPMENT

Location

Northwest corner of Shoal Lake on the Manitoba-Ontario border (Shoal Lake Indian Reserve 40).

Initiator

Department of Indian & Northern Affairs

Contact

Mr. Dennis Wallace
District Manager
Indian & Northern Affairs
100 - 4th Avenue South
Kenora, Ontario
P9N 1Y6

Proponents

Shoal Lake Band No. 40

Description

The proposed project includes a cottage lot development on the peninsula between Snowshoe Bay and Indian Bay on the northwest corner of Shoal Lake. An access road is planned to link with the Trans-Canada Highway west of Falcon Lake, Manitoba.

Possible Environmental and Social Impacts

- deterioration of water quality - the lake is the reservoir for Winnipeg's water supply
- displacement of wildlife species
- social and cultural significance of public access
- increased recreational pressures on Shoal Lake

Status under EARP

The project was referred to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office on March 31, 1980.

Panel Member appointed to date:

R. G. Connelly
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R. L. Greyell
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ont.
K1A 0H3

Future Events

1. A panel will be formed to conduct a public review of the project.
2. Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared and issued by the Panel.

SLAVE RIVER HYDRO PROJECT

Location

- a) At the border of Alberta and Northwest Territories, near Fort Smith, N.W.T. and adjacent to Wood Buffalo National Park.
- b) Transmission line from the Fort Smith area to Fort McMurray, Alberta.

Initiator:

Parks Canada, Department of the Environment

Contact: Mr. W Douglas Harper, Director, Prairie Region, Parks Canada,
114 Garry Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba. R3C1G1

Description

The proposed project focuses on a hydro-electric installation at or near Fort Smith, N.W.T. to develop the potential of the Slave River.

Possible Environmental Impacts

a) **Damsite**

- 1. A reservoir would be created which could impact on fish, wildlife and other resources and which could inundate lands in Wood Buffalo Park.
- 2. Construction sites and activities could impact on wildlife and fish resources.

b) **Transmission Lines**

- 1. The construction and maintenance of transmission lines could have impact on fish and wildlife in the area.

Status under EARP

This project was referred by Parks Canada to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in January, 1980. Panel formation is proceeding. Appointed to date are:

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

B. C. Lieff
Superintendent
Wood Buffalo National Park
Fort Smith, N.W.T.

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.L. Greyell
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(819) 9974000

Future Events

The Government of Alberta has announced a two year feasibility study of developing hydroelectric power on the Slave River between Fort Smith and Fitzgerald. Discussions between FEARO and the province are being held to determine FEARO's role in the environmental review of the project.

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:

Dave Marshall
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
Government of Yukon
Whitehorse, Yukon

Executive Secretary to the Panel: 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.

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. V6C 1A2

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:

**Dave Marshall
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)**

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

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

**J. P. Sector, Manager
Evaluation Section, Assessment Br.
Assessment and Planning Division
British Columbia Ministry of
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

The future of this project is uncertain. The preparation of the EIS has not begun.

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).**

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
12. Boundary Bay Airport Reactivation
Report to the Minister, November 1979.
13. El dorado Uranium Refinery, R.M. of Corman Park, Saskatchewan
Report to the Minister, July 1980.

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 (UF₆). 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 (UF₆). 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).

12. BOUNDARY BAY AIRPORT REACTIVATION

The Boundary Bay Airport project involves the reactivation of a World War II Air Force base for use as a general aviation airport. The airport is located south of Vancouver within the municipality of Delta on a site adjacent to the ecologically important Boundary Bay. Use of the airport would be restricted to light non-jet powered aircraft. At design capacity, the airport would be able to handle 250,000 movements per year with 70% of these movements expected to result from flying training. The project is being proposed to reduce a possible safety hazard at Vancouver International Airport through relocation of some of the light aircraft now using that facility to a more suitable facility and to accommodate expected growth in general aviation in British Columbia's Lower Mainland.

The project was referred to FEARO for a Panel review in late 1976 and a Panel was established in early 1977.

The Panel prepared draft EIS guidelines which were subjected to a public review culminating in a public meeting held on July 26, 1978. The guidelines were then finalized and issued to Transport Canada on September 11, 1978. The completed EIS, prepared by Transport Canada with the assistance of F.F. Slaney & Company Limited, was submitted to the Panel in February 1979. The EIS was given wide distribution by the Panel to the public and government agencies. The Panel completed its review of the project by holding a series of public meetings in Delta between June 24 and June 28, 1979.

The Panel report was submitted to the Minister of the Environment in November 1979. In the report, the Panel concluded that the airport could be reactivated without significant adverse ecological or social impacts providing appropriate procedures were followed and certain mitigation measures implemented. Included in the Panel's recommendations was a call for the establishment of an Airport Review Committee to monitor the construction and early operation of the airport.

The Minister of the Environment has endorsed the Panel's report.

13. ELDORADO URANIUM REFINERY, R. M. OF CORMAN PARK, SASKATCHEWAN

In July, 1979, Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. issued an Environmental Impact Statement for a proposal to construct a uranium refinery. The proposed location was in the Rural Municipality of Corman Park, near Warman, 23 km northeast of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. The refinery would produce 9000 tonnes per year of uranium as uranium hexafluoride. It would process uranium concentrates from Saskatchewan mines and export the product, uranium hexafluoride.

The Environmental Assessment Panel solicited comments from the public and from technical agencies and, in January 1980, held public meetings in Martensville, (near Saskatoon) and Saskatoon. The Panel's report was submitted to the Minister of Environment in July, 1980.

The Panel considered issues relating to the need for the project, the potential impact on the physical and human environment and project monitoring.

The Panel's review led to the conclusion that because of the uncertainty with respect to social impact, it could not endorse the site selected by Eldorado for the proposed refinery. While available information was sufficient to permit the Panel to conclude that the impact on the physical environment would be minimal, the panel was unable to reach a conclusion on the potential impact on the human environment.

In addition, the Panel was also concerned that the project might be incompatible with the proposed recreational development at nearby Cathedral Bluffs.

The Panel also concluded, however, that the refinery and plant process were generally acceptable provided certain conditions were met. In the Panel's opinion, Eldorado demonstrated that it was reasonable to plan for another refinery in Canada and that a site in Saskatchewan would be consistent with existing federal and Saskatchewan government policies.

The Panel recommended that before a decision is made about the refinery site, three options be considered:

1. Further information be provided by Eldorado with respect to the potential social impacts of the Warman proposal, -with subsequent public review. The Panel has outlined a number of site-specific guidelines to assist the proponent in this regard.
2. One or more alternative sites in Saskatchewan be selected and evaluated with regard to social and environmental impacts and submitted for public review.
3. One or more sites in Saskatchewan be evaluated and reviewed in comparison or conjunction with the Warman site. This would be a combination of options 1 and 2.

The Minister of the Environment has conveyed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources the Panel's concerns and made him aware of the various options.

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE

Departure of Executive Chairman

Effective July 1st, 1980, **Mr. F.G. Hurtubise**, Executive Chairman since **October 1976**, accepted a position as Vice-President (Scientific) with Forintek, a private forest industry research organization.

Administration and Staff

The Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office is administered by an Executive Chairman appointed by the Minister of the Environment. The present Acting Executive Chairman is Mr. J.S. Klenavic.

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

<u>NAME & TITLE</u>	<u>GENERAL DUTIES</u>
Mr. J.S. Klenavic Acting Executive Chairman	Chairman of Panels Responsible for panel operations Develops public participation plans Implements operational policy and procedures
Dr. Patrick J.B. Duffy	Director Operations Prairie and Northern areas Chairman of Panels
Mr. R.G. Connelly	Director Operations Central Area Chairman of Panels
Mr. D.W.I. Marshall	Director Operations Pacific area Chairman of Panels
Mr. P.J. Paradine	Director Operations Atlantic area Chairman of Panels
Mr. Guy Riverin	Executive Secretary to Panels
Mr. R.L. Greyell	Executive Secretary to Panels.
Mr. Yvan Vigneault	Executive Secretary to the "Port of Québec Expansion" panel.
Mr. J.M. Thomas	Senior Advisor and Manager publications
Mr. J.F. Herity, Director General, Process Development and Evaluation Directorate	EARP policy coordination and evaluation Liaison and coordination with federal departments and agencies
Mr. Paul G. Wolf	Director, Process Development

Mr. J.G. Gainer	Policy Advisor
Mr. C.D. Robertson	Director, Process Evaluation and Coordination Branch
Dr. W.J. Couch	Analyst, Process evaluation and review
Mrs. Suzanne Latour	Administrative Officer

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

Mailing address: FEARO, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3

Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office

700 - 789 West Pender Street

Vancouver, B.C.

V6C 1H2

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**
Published separately for each project.
6. **Panel reports to the Minister of the Environment on the Panel Projects**
7. **Environmental Assessment Panels - What They Are - What They Do**