

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
MARCH 1979



Government of Canada

Environmental
Assessment Review

Gouvernement du Canada

Examen des
évaluations environnementales

Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1979

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

ISBN : 0-662-50171-3

ISSN-0704-1985

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
Boundary Bay Aerodrome - Reactivation	13
C.N. Telecommunications System - Wood Buffalo National Park.....	15
Dempster Pipeline Project	16
Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling - South Davis Strait Project	18
Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling - North Davis Strait Project.....	20
Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. - Expansion of Uranium Refinery Capacity.....	22
Fraser River Training Works Program	25
Hamilton Airport Project	27
Lower Churchill Hydro Electric Project	29
Lancaster Sound Offshore Drilling Project	32
Mackenzie Delta Gas Gathering System	34
Mackenzie River Dredging Program	36
Polar Gas Project	38
Quebec Port Expansion Project	40
Roberts Bank Bulk Loading Facility Expansion	42
Shakwak Project (Haines Road/Alaska Highway)	44
Vancouver International Airport - Expansion of Air Traffic Capacity	47
Yukon Transportation Study	49

LIST OF REVIEWED PANEL PROJECTS	51
Point Lepreau NB Nuclear Generating Station.....	52
Wreck Cove Hydro Electric Power Project.....	53
GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE	
Administration and Staff.....	54
Publications*	56

INTRODUCTION

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

The contents are arranged as follows:

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

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

This section is subdivided as follows:

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

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.

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 contacts, 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.

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 "Guide to the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process" which may be obtained from Information Services Directorate, Environment Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3.

ALASKA HIGHWAY GAS PIPELINE PROJECT

Location

Southern sector of the Yukon Territory.

Prononent

Foothills Pipelines (South Yukon) Ltd.

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

Initiator

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

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

Description

Construction and operation of a 48 inch diameter 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.
4. Scarring of landscape in National Park areas.

Status Under EARP

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

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

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

C. Wykes
District Manager
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, Québec

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

L. Chambers
Director, Natural Resources Branch
Yukon Territorial Government
Whitehorse, Yukon

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

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

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

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

The Panel delivered its report to the Minister in early August, 1977. The Governments of Canada and of the U.S.A. agreed in September 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. Those guidelines are available to interested parties on request.

Future Panel Events

An Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared by the Proponent and distributed for public and technical review. Public hearings will be held in Yukon communities, including Whitehorse, in March and April of 1979. Upon completion of the review phase, the Panel will report to the Minister of the Environment on the adequacy of environmental planning on the project.

ARCTIC PILOT PROJECT

Location

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

Initiator

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

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

Petro-Canada (for contact see Proponent)

Proponent

Petro-Canada

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

Description

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

In addition to possible environmental disruptions resulting from gas drilling and construction of gas gathering systems, other environmental problems could include effects on marine mammals and bird populations, in addition to effects on fish and fish food organisms.

Specific impacts are not known at this time.

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 Impact Statement has been prepared and has been circulated to government agencies for review.

Panel members are:

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental
Assessment Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

H. Blandford
Canadian Hydrographic Service
Ocean and Aquatic Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario

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

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

R.W. Hornal

Regional Director
Northern Operations
Dept. of Indian Affairs and
Northern Development
Yellowknife, NWT

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.G. Connelly

Future Panel Events

Upon review of the EIS by the Panel and government agencies, the Panel will make the reviews public and issue a statement of deficiency which will constitute guidelines for the completion of the assessment.

Public hearings are expected to take place in late 1979 or early 1980.

BANFF NATIONAL PARK HIGHWAY PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

Location

The Trans-Canada Highway in Banff National Park from the eastern gate to Healy Creek. (17 miles)

Proponent

Federal Department of Public Works

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 is being formed. Panel members are:

J. S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
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
Program Director
Environmental Sciences
Faculty of Environmental Design
University of Calgary, Alberta

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J. Paradine

The review will take place in two parts (mile 0 to 7.8 and Mile 7.8 to 17) Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement have been issued. The **EIS** for the first section has been prepared. A public participation program has begun.

Future Panel Events

The EIS for mile 0 to 7.8 is presently being reviewed. Public and technical agency review will be followed by Public Hearings in May. The panel review of mile 7.8 to 17 will take place at a later date.

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

Contact: A.E. Collin, ADM, Atmospheric Environment Service, Environment
Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. K1A 0H3

Description

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

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

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

Status Under EARP

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J. Paradine

Future Panel 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.

REACTIVATION OF BOUNDARY BAY AERODROME

Location

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

Initiator

Federal Department of Transport (Canadian Air Transportation Administration).

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

Description

The project was proposed as a result of the Master Planning exercise conducted by the initiator for the Lower Mainland area of British Columbia. For the general aviation aircraft category, the Plan concluded that by 1980 all of the existing capacity of the region's airports would be required plus a new airport. Reactivation of Boundary Bay would serve this purpose and would also encourage the shift of light aircraft from Vancouver International. It is projected that only propeller driven planes would use Boundary Bay. Projected costs and start of construction dates are not yet known.

Possible Environmental Impacts

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

Status Under EARP

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

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

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

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

S. Veit
Social Science Researcher
Galiano Island, B.C.

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

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: J.F. Herity, FEARO,
1870 - 1050 West Pender St.,
Vancouver, B.C. (604) 666-2431

The Panel issued draft guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for public and government agency comment and held a public meeting July 26, 1978, to hear comments. Final guidelines were issued to the Proponent September 11, 1978.

Future Panel Events

Transport Canada will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. When this has been received, the Panel will organize a public review.

Documents Available:

Compendium of Written Submissions to the Panel on the draft Guidelines
Transcript of Public Meeting (\$3.00)
Guidelines for preparing an EIS.

CN TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM - WOOD BUFFALO NATIONAL PARK

Location

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

Proponent

Canadian National Telecommunications

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

Initiator

Parks Canada, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

Contact: S.F. Kun, Director, National Parks Branch, Parks Canada,
Indian and Northern Affairs, Ottawa, Ontario. K1A 0H4

Description

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

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

Status Under EARP

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J.B. Duffy

Future Panel Events

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

DEMPSTER PIPELINE PROJECT

Location

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

Proponent

Foothills Pipelines Yukon Limited.

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

Initiator

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

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

Description

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

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

Status Under EARP

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

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

C. Wykes
District Manager
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
Director, Natural Resources Branch
Yukon Territorial Government
Whitehorse, Yukon.

M. Hawkes
Government of the N.W.T.
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

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

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

Panel Events

1. Formal guidelines for the preparation of an environmental impact statement have been issued publicly and are available from the Panel Secretary.
2. The Panel will conduct technical and public review of the environmental impact statement when it is produced by the proponent.
3. The Panel will subsequently make **recommandations** to the Minister of the Environment concerning the implementation of the project.

EASTERN ARCTIC OFFSHORE DRILLING - SOUTH DAVIS STRAIT PROJECT

Location

Waters of the eastern coast of Baffin Island and the eastern part of Hudson Strait including Ungava Bay.

Initiator

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (DINA)

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

Proponent:

Imperial Oil Ltd., Aquitaine Company of Canada Ltd., Canada Cities Service Ltd., (Effective September 1, 1978, Imperial Oil Ltd. transferred its interests in this project to ESSO Resources Canada Ltd).

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

Guidelines for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were given to the industry by DINA in July, 1976. Upon referral of the project to the Environmental Assessment Panel in the summer of 1977, these guidelines were modified to reflect the requirements of the Panel and were then re-issued to the proponent by DINA. The EIS and supporting documentation were submitted to the Panel in June, 1978 by DINA for review. The Panel secretariat distributed copies of the EIS and supporting documentation to technical agencies and public interest groups for comment. Copies of an Inuktituk translation of the EIS summary were distributed to each of the communities in the immediate area of the proposed project.

The Panel held community hearings in Pangnirtung (Sept.8), Allen Island (Sept.11) Lake Harbour (Sept.11), and Cape Dorset (Sept. 12) to hear the views of the local residents about the project. Commencing September 13, 1978, the Panel held a two-day public hearing in Frobisher Bay where a more structured set of procedures was followed.

Panel members were:

J.S.Klenavic

Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

M.J. Morisson

Assistant Regional Director
of Non-Renewable Resources
Dept. of Indian and Northern Affairs
P.O. Box 1500
Yellowknife NWT

J. R. MacDonald

Environmental Protection Service
5151 George Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3E4

K. B. Yuen

Chief, Ocean Sciences Affairs
Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
7th floor, 240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E6

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P. Paradine

Conclusion:

Following the hearings the Panel report was prepared and submitted to the Minister of Environment on November 1, 1978.

The Panel recommended that the project proceed as proposed with the following conditions:

i) 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.

ii) 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.

iii) The Proponent is able to provide same-season relief well capability.

iv) Liability and compensation provisions under existing regulation be examined by responsible regulatory authorities to ensure their adequacy under current circumstances.

v) 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 agreed with the Panel Report recommendations shortly after it was released.

The Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs announced his acceptance of these recommendations in January 1979.

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, Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H4

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 and is expected to be submitted in July 1979.

Panel members are:

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
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. Morison
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
5151 George Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3E4

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

Future Panel Events

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

ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED - EXPANSION OF URANIUM REFINING CAPACITY

Location

The potential sites for the proposed refineries are in the provinces of Ontario and Saskatchewan (one refinery per province). The decision to proceed and the exact locations will depend upon environmental and other approvals, engineering and market feasibility studies.

Initiator

Eldorado Nuclear Ltd.

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

Description

- a) Ontario: the proposed project is to construct a uranium refinery with a capacity of 9,000 metric tons natural uranium in the form of uranium hexafluoride (UF₆). The refinery will process ore concentrates (yellowcake) primarily from mines located in Ontario to produce uranium hexafluoride for United States and overseas market. Uranium hexafluoride is the feedstock for uranium enrichment plants which do not currently exist in Canada since the Candu reactor does not require enriched uranium.
- b) Saskatchewan; 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.

The total estimated cost of both refineries is \$150 million (1975 dollars) and the projected production start-up date is 1980-81.

Status Under EARP

Members of the Panel are:
J.S Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office, Ottawa
(Chairman)

D.P. Scott
Freshwater Institute
Fisheries and Marine Service
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Winnipeg, Manitoba

P.M. Bird
Director-General, Liaison &
Coordination Directorate
Planning and Finance Service
Environment Canada, Ottawa

K. Shikaze
Chief, Environmental Control
Division
Environmental Protection
Service
Environment Canada
Toronto, Ontario

C. Cheng
Canada Centre for Inland Waters
Environment Canada
Burlington, Ontario

Ellan Derow
Assistant Professor, McMaster
University
Department of Sociology
Hamilton, Ontario.

R.S. Lang
Associate Professor, York University
Faculty of Environmental Studies
Downsview, Ontario

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R. G. Connelly

Ontario Site

The Panel completed its review of the Ontario site (Port Granby), proposed by Eldorado, May 12, 1978, when it submitted its report to the Minister of the Environment, Len Marchand. The report stated that the refinery and plant process 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.

On July 27, 1978, Eldorado notified the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office that it planned to submit for review, environmental impact statements on each of three possible new locations for the Company's proposed Ontario uranium refinery. The three sites proposed are in the Blind River, Port Hope and Sudbury regions.

The three Environmental Impact Statements were received and distributed to the public and interested parties. Public hearings were held over a two week period in each of the three areas in November and December, 1978. The Panel report was submitted to the Minister of the Environment on February 23, 1979.

Conclusion (Ontario site)

The Panel's review has led to the conclusion that all three sites are acceptable for the project if certain conditions are met. In finding the refinery and its processes acceptable, the Panel recommended adherence by Eldorado to a number of conditions related to improved detection of spills affecting the wastewater systems, transportation routing, plant decommissioning and monitoring, including the establishment of a public monitoring committee. In addition, the Panel recommended conditions for each specific site.

Saskatchewan Site

After study of 14 potential locations, **Warman**, near Saskatoon, has been selected for detailed environmental assessment.

Future Panel Events (Saskatchewan Project)

The environmental studies for the Saskatchewan site are near completion.

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

Location

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

Initiator

Federal Department of Public Works

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

Description

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

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

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

Status Under EARP

Panel formed July 1976. Members are:

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

E. D. Johnson
Environmental Co-ordinator
Public Works Canada
Vancouver, B.C.

F.C. Boyd
A Director
Habitat Protection Directorate
Fisheries & Marine Service
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Vancouver, B.C.

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

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

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: Mr. J.F. Herity, FEARO
1870-1050 West Pender St.,
Vancouver, B.C. (604) 666-2431

Guidelines for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) have been issued by the Panel and are available to the public. Public Works Canada has engaged a consultant to prepare the EIS. The EIS is expected to be completed in late summer 1979.

Future Panel Events

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

Panel Documents

IEE
Guidelines

HAMILTON AIRPORT EXPANSION PROJECT

Location

Hamilton (Mount Hope), Ontario

Initiator

Federal Department of Transport (Canadian Air Transportation Administration).

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

Description

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

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

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

Status Under EARP

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

Panel members are:

Patrick J.B. Duffy
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Interim chairman in the
absence of Mr. J.S. Klenavic)

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

Alan MacDonald
Ontario Region
Environmental Management Service
Environment Canada
Burlington, Ontario

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

Rolf Hedman
Transport Canada
4900 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario

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

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

LOWER CHURCHILL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Gull Island & Muskrat Falls Generation sites

Labrador/Newfoundland Electric power transmission line & tunnel

Location

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

Proponent

Lower Churchill Development Corporation

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

Initiator

Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources

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

Description

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

Possible Environmental **Impacts**

a) Damsite

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

b) Transmission line

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

Status Under EARP

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

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

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

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

G.E. Beanlands
Director, Inland Waters Directorate
Environment Canada
P.O. Box 365
Halifax, N. S.
B3J 2P8.

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

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J. Paradine

a) Guidelines for the generation site environmental impact statement have been issued and environmental studies are being carried out during 1978-1979.

b) The Panel did not produce guidelines for the transmission line as a preliminary environmental impact statement was in **existence**. This document has been undergoing public and technical agency review.

Future Panel Events

Public hearings for the transmission line will be scheduled by the Panel during 1979. Hearings on the generation sites will take place after receipt of the EIS and public and technical review of its contents; probably during 1980.

LANCASTER SOUND DRILLING PROJECT

Location

Lancaster Sound, Northwest Territories

Initiator

Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

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

Proponent

Norlands Petroleums Limited

Description:

Offshore drilling in the waters of Lancaster Sound

Possible Environmental Impacts

The major environmental concerns are those related to the effects of a possible blowout in the Lancaster Sound area. In the case of a blowout not only could vast areas of shoreline be contaminated but also, effects would be evidenced in the sea birds of the area, marine mammals and fish and fish food organisms.

Status under EARP

The project was referred for Panel consideration in July 1977 along with the Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling Projects. The Environmental Impact Statement and supporting documentation were submitted to the Panel in July 1978 for formal review. Copies of this documentation were distributed to technical review agencies and requests made for their comments.

The Panel held community hearings in Arctic Bay (October 12), Resolute Bay (October 13), Cresswell Bay (October 14), Grise Fiord (October 16), and Pond Inlet (October 17) to hear the views of the local residents about the project. During October 18-19 and November 28-30 the Panel held two phases of public hearings in Pond Inlet where a more structured set of procedures was followed.

Panel Members are:

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

K.B. Yuen
Chief, Ocean Sciences Affairs
Ocean and Aquatic Sciences
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
7th Floor, 240 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0E6

C.A. Lewis
Environmental Assessment and
Design Division
Environmental Protection Service
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 1C7

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

D.W.I. Marshall
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario

Observer at the Panel:

D. Gilday
Government of the Northwest Territories
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P. Paradine

Conclusion

The Panel presented its report to the Minister of the Environment on February 14, 1979. Subsequently the Minister released the report to the public, and indicated his agreement with the Panel's recommendations. The Panel recommends that exploratory drilling of Dundas K-56 be deferred until such a time as:

- i) the government has addressed the issue of the best use(s) of Lancaster Sound;
- ii) the Proponent has demonstrated both a **capaility** 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 **DINA** 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. There is inadequacy in the existing scientific knowledge of the Arctic and the Panel makes a recommendation for increasing government support for Arctic programs.

MACKENZIE DELTA GAS GATHERING SYSTEM

Location

Mackenzie River Delta Region, Northwest Territories

Proponents

Imperial Oil, Gulf Oil and Shell Oil

Initiator

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Contact: Dr. O. Løken DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, 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 **disburbance**, 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
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office, Ottawa
(Chairman)

M. Morison
Assistant Regional Director
Non-Renewable Resources
Dept. of Indian Affairs and
Northern Development
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.

D. Surrendi, Chief
Migratory Bird Management
Division
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Edmonton, Alberta

R. Frith
Environmental Protection Service
Environment Canada
Edmonton, Alberta

Executive Secretary to the Panel: **P.J.B. Duffy**, FEARO, 13th Floor, Fontaine
Bldg. Ottawa. **K1A** OH3 (819) 997-1000

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

Future Panel Events

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

MACKENZIE RIVER DREDGING PROGRAM

Location

Mackenzie River, between Hay River and the Mackenzie River Delta, N.W.T.

Initiator

Arctic Transportation Agency, Federal Department of Transport. (Project Agency, Federal Department of Public Works)

Contact: J.J. Séguin, Administrator, Arctic Transportation Agency,
Transport Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.

Description

Improvement of the navigation channel in the specified section of the waterway, to provide for a minimum 8 foot grade depth and 350 foot width allowing 6 foot draft vessel loadings. This would include channel realignments at rapids areas to eliminate barge relay operations. This program could be undertaken either in support of construction logistics for a Mackenzie Valley natural gas pipeline or as a permanent piece of transportation infrastructure to meet long term traffic growth. For pipeline construction support, a three year program may be the most desirable. Total estimated cost \$45 million (1975 dollars). For long term traffic growth, a five year program would be more suitable with estimated cost \$40 million (1975 dollars).

This project is presently in abeyance following the Federal Government decision to proceed with planning the Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline rather than the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Project.

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Changes in water levels and related environmental effects.
2. Effect of dredging on fisheries.
3. Disturbance of bird populations.
4. Change in river regime and effects on the ecology of river banks.
5. Faunal, floral, and other effects, i.e. changes to historical and archaeological sites.

Status Under EARP

Request for Panel review was made in April 1976. The panel was formed in May 1976.

Panel members are:

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

K. Davies
Water Survey of Canada
Environment Canada
Calgary, Alberta

J.J. Séguin
Administrator
Arctic Transportation Agency
Transport Canada
Ottawa, Ontario

R.J. Paterson
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans
Ottawa, Ontario.

V.D. Hawley
Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Edmonton, Alberta

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J.B. Duffy, FEARO, 13th Floor, Fontaine
Bldg, Ottawa. KIA OH3 (819) 997-1000

Guidelines for the production of the Environmental Impact Statement were issued by the Panel to the initiator in July 1976. These are available to the public.

Because of a change in demand for large scale dredging activity on the Mackenzie River, planning for this Project has been suspended. An Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared by the initiating department and is the subject of technical review by Federal Government agencies at the present time. If and when large scale dredging is further contemplated by the initiating department, the Environmental Impact Statement will be updated and given public distribution. Following this distribution, the Environmental Assessment Panel will arrange for public meetings to receive comments from agencies, organizations, and individuals outside of government as to the adequacy of environmental planning on this Project.

Until the 'project is reactivated by the initiator, there will be no further project descriptions in the Environmental Assessment Panel Project Registry.

POLAR GAS PROJECT

Location

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

Proponents

Polar Gas Consortium and Panarctic Gas Ltd.

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

Co-Initiators

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

Contact: M. Ruel, **DINA**, Les Terrasses de la **Chaudière**, Ottawa, Ontario.
K1A OH4

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 OE4**

Description

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

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
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.G. Connelly

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

Future Panel Events

Formal review of the EIS will take place in 1979.

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
Environment Canada, 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. Ouimet
Conseil québécois des Loisirs
2360, Chemin Ste Foy
Ste-Foy Québec G1V 4H2

Marcel Lortie
Environment Canada E.M.S.
P.O. Box 10,000
Ste-Foy, Québec G1V 4H5

Gabriel Filteau
Fisheries and Marine Service Research
901, rue Cap Diamant 3rd floor, Room 302
Québec, G1K 7X7

Fernand Tremblay
819, Rue Moreau,
Ste-Foy, Québec G1V 3B5

Executive Secretary to the Panel: Yvan Vigneault, 2700 Laurier Boulevard,
Québec, Québec. G1V 4H5
Tel. (418) 694-3964

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 Panel Events

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

Panel Document

Guidelines for preparation of the environmental impact statement.

ROBERTS BANK BULK LOADING FACILITY EXPANSION

Location

Roberts Bank, British Columbia. The port is located close to the U.S./Canada border, some 20 miles south of Vancouver.

Initiator

National Harbours Board, Department of Transport.

Contact: B.A. Ekstrom, Assistant General Manager, Port of Vancouver,
200 Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C.

Description

Proposed expansion of the existing Roberts Bank bulk loading facility into the offshore estuary area. The proposed (second phase) of construction - expansion would add approximately 200 acres to the existing facility which is used to export coal. This would include four new integrated, receiving, storing and automatic ship loading bays capable of handling coal, and other bulk commodities. The proposed facility would cost \$24 million (1975 dollars).

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Removal of land from existing and potential uses.
2. Conflict with commercial and recreational use of adjacent waters.
3. Impairment of marine and intertidal environments.
4. Effects on vegetation, benthic and littoral organisms including utilization of areas by fish species.
5. Impairment of the atmospheric environment by **airborn** pollution resulting from the storage and handling of non-containerized bulk commodities.

Status Under EARP

The project was submitted to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office for a Panel review, May 1975. The Panel was formed at the same time. Panel members are:

J.S. Klenavic
Director, Operations
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Ottawa, Ontario
(Chairman)

M. B. Pepper
Managing Director
Vancouver Board of Trade
Vancouver, B.C.

D.S. Lacate
Regional Director
Lands Directorate
Pacific Region
Vancouver, B.C.

M. Waldichuk
Program Head
Pacific Environment Institute
Environment Canada
West Vancouver, B.C.

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

W. J. Mussell
National Parole Board
Burnaby, B.C.

Executive Secretary to the Panel: J.F. Herity, FEARO,
1870-1050 West Pender St.,
Vancouver, B.C. (604) 666-2431

The completed Environmental Impact Statement was received by the Panel from the National Harbours Board on November 18, 1977. It was reviewed by the Panel, the public and federal, provincial, regional and municipal government agencies.

The first stage of the Panel review resulted in a list of deficiencies in the EIS being presented to the National Harbours Board in February, 1978. These are available to the public, as is a 200 page document containing all written comment received so far by the Panel.

The NHB's response to the deficiency statement was received in June 1978 and is available to the public.

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

Conclusion

Following the hearings the Panel report was prepared and will be submitted to the Minister of the Environment in March of 1979.

Panel Documents

Guidelines

EIS

Written comments on Phase I review

Deficiency statement

Response to deficiencies

Written comments on Phase 2 (final) review

Transcript of Public Hearings (\$5.00)

SHAKWAK PROJECT (HAINES ROAD/ALASKA HIGHWAY)

Location

Northwestern British Columbia and the Yukon

Prononent

United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highways Administration

Initiator

Canadian Federal Department of Public Works

Contact: G.P. Luke, Shakwak Project Manager, Public Works Canada,
201 Range Road, Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 3A4.

Description

Reconstruction and paving of the portion of the Alaska Highway from the Alaska Yukon border to Haines Junction in Canada, and the Haines cut-off road from Haines Junction to the B.C./Alaska border. Existing alignments will be used for the major portion of the project. The proposed start of the project is 1978 and the estimated cost may exceed \$200 million. The capital financing will be supplied by the U.S.

Possible Environmental Impacts

1. Removal of vegetative cover and its effect on plant communities, wildlife habitat and areas underlain with perma-frost.
2. Interference with traditional wildlife movement routes.
3. Impairment of fish habitats through sedimentation of spawning beds or actual removal of stream bed gravels.
4. Further reduction of wilderness values due to induced recreational use of the road and region.
5. Reduction of game populations and fish stocks by increased hunting and fishing.

Status Under EARP

The request for a Panel was received July 1974 and the Panel was formed March 1975. Members are:

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

G.D. Tench
Manager, Design and Construction
Pacific Region
Department of Public Works
Vancouver, B.C.

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

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

W.A. Bilawich
Special Projects Coordinator
Government of Yukon
Whitehorse, Y.T.

P. H. **Beaubier**
Regional Manager, Land Resources
Department of Indian and
Northern Affairs
Whitehorse, Y.T. Victoria, B.C.

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: J.F. Herity, FEARO,
1870-1050 West Pender St.,
Vancouver, B.C. (604) 666-2431

Guidelines for the preparation of the environmental impact statement were **finalized** and approved May, 1976, after discussions with the U.S., Province of British Columbia and the federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs: an environmental impact statement was completed and submitted by Public Works Canada to the Panel January 3, 1978. The document has been widely distributed by the Panel for public and government review in Canada. It was also reviewed at the same time in the United States.

Public hearings were held by the Panel in Whitehorse and communities along the project corridor in March, 1978. Transcripts of the hearings are available as well as a book containing all written submissions to the Panel. The Panel's report, containing its recommendations on the project was submitted to Environment Minister Len **Marchand** in June, 1978. The transmittal of the report concludes the work of the Panel for this project.

Conclusion:

The Panel has 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 project managers, the governments involved and the general public must all share the responsibility for and be committed to ensuring that the project goes ahead without undue impact.

The potential for adverse social and environmental impact is significant and the project must be carefully planned and monitored throughout its life so that none of the areas of possible impact develops into a serious

problem. The Panel acknowledges the planning which is already under way to develop opportunities for social and ecological benefit from the project and to mitigate potential impacts.

The Panel's report contains approximately 35 detailed recommendations on how the project should be carried out.

Panel Documents

Guidelines

EIS

Compendium of written input

Transcripts of hearings (\$5.00)

Final EIS

Panel report

EXPANSION OF AIR TRAFFIC CAPACITY OF VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Location

Vancouver International Airport, Richmond, British Columbia.

Initiator

Federal Department of Transport (Canadian Air Transportation Administration)

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

Description

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

Possible Environmental Impacts

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

Status Under EARP

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

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

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

R. W. Stewart
Director General
Ocean and Aquatic Sciences
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans
Sidney, B.C.

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

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

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

S. Veit
Social Science Researcher
Galiano Island, B.C.

Executive Secretary to the Panel: Mr. J.F. Herity, FEARO,
1870-1050 West Pender St.,
Vancouver, B.C. (604) 666-2431

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

Dr. V.C. Brink and Ms. Suzanne Veit were appointed by Minister Len **Marchand** to the Panel. These appointments are from outside government.

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

Future Panel Events

Transport Canada will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement, based on the Guidelines and will submit that to the Panel for public review.

Panel Documents

Guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.
Compendium of written submissions to the Panel on the draft guidelines
Transcript of public hearings on the draft guidelines (\$5.00).

SOUTH YUKON TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Location

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

Initiator

Federal Department of Transport

Contact: D.J. Schmirler, Western Coordinator, Railway Transportation
Directorate, Transport Canada, 2760-200 Granville Street,
Vancouver, B.C.

Description

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

Possible Areas of Environmental Impact

Not known at present

Status Under EARP

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

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

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

G.A.E. Jones
Manager, Northern B.C.
and Yukon Branch
Fisheries Management
Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans
Vancouver, B.C.

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

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

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel: Mr. J.F. Herity, FEARO,
1870-1050 West Pender St.,
Vancouver, B.C. (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 Panel Events

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

Panel Documents.

Guidelines for analysis of alternatives.

LIST OF REVIEWED PROJECTS UNDER
THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW PROCESS

- ~~P~~oint Lepreau, New Brunswick
Nuclear Power Station
Report to the Minister, May 1975
(Register No.7, March 1979, page 53)
- ~~W~~reck Cove, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia
Hydro Electric Power Project
Report to the Minister, August 1976
(Register No. 7, March 1979, page 54)
- Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline project, Yukon Territory
Interim report to the Minister, August 1, 1977
(Register No. 7, March 1979) page 4
- ~~E~~ldorado Nuclear Limited, Uranium Refinery, Port Granby, Ontario
Report to the Minister, May 12, 1978
(Register No. 7, March 1979, page 22)
- ~~S~~haskwak Highway Project, Northern B.C. and Yukon
Report to the Minister, June 1978
(Register No. 7, March 1979, page 44)
- Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling, South Davis Strait Project. N.W.T.
Report to the Minister, November 1, 1978
(Register No.7, March 1979, page 18)
- ~~L~~ancaster Sound Offshore Drilling Project, Northwest Territories
Report to the Minister, January 1979.
(Register No.7 March 1979, page 32)
- ~~E~~ldorado uranium hexafluoride refinery, Ontario
Report to the Minister March 1979.
(Register No.7 March 1979, page 22)

POINT LEPREAU NB NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

Conclusion

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.

WRECK COVE HYDRO ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

Conclusion

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 Affairs and Northern Development.

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE

Administration and Staff

Process procedures, particularly the operation of Panels are administered by a permanent Executive Chairman appointed by the Minister of the Environment. The present Executive Chairman is Mr. F.G. Hurtubise. He (or his delegate) chairs all Panels established to review projects and he reports to the Minister of Environment on recommendations made by Panels. The office administered by the permanent chairman was previously known as the Environmental Assessment Panel Office. This title has since been changed to Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office and the title of the permanent chairman to Executive Chairman. This adjustment in designation does not in any way change the responsibilities of the permanent chairman (or his office) under the Process, but is designed to clarify the difference between the separate Environmental Assessment Panels established to **review** each project, and the permanent chairman's administrative obligations for the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process as a whole.

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 Director, Operations	Chairman Panel Projects Responsible for panel operations, Develops public participation plans Implements operational policy and procedures.
Dr. Patrick J.B. Duffy	Executive secretary to panels.
Mr. R.G. Connelly	Executive Secretary to panels.
Mr. P.J. Paradine	Executive secretary to panels.
Mr. Yvan Vigneault	Executive Secretary to the "Port of Québec expansion" panel.

Mr. J.M. Thomas	Manager, publications Executive secretary to panels
Mr. W.S. Tait Director, Policy Coordination and Evaluation	EARP policy coordination and evaluation Liaison and coordination with federal departments and agencies.
Mr. Paul G. Wolf	Senior analyst, EARP process development
Mr. J.G. Gainer	Analyst, EARP process development
Mr. C.D. Robertson	Senior analyst, Earp process evaluation and review.
Dr. W.J. Couch	Analyst, EARP process evaluation and review.

A Regional Office has been established in Vancouver. The Manager of the Office is Mr. John Herity assisted by Mr. Paul F. Scott. One of the principal functions of this office will be as point of contact with the public on panel projects.

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 OH3	Telephone: (819) 997-1000
or: J.F. Herity Manager, Pacific Region Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office 1050 West Pender St., Room 1870 Vancouver, B.C. V6E 3S7	Telephone: (604) 666-2431

Publications

The following publications are available from the following offices:

Information Services Directorate
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3

Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office
13th Floor, Fontaine Building
200 Sacred Heart Boulevard
Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3

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

1. "A 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 Sacred Heart Boulevard, Hull, P.Q. K1A 0H3)
3. "Guidelines for preparing Initial Environmental Evaluations"
4. "A Guide for Environmental Screening"
5. Guidelines for the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements prepared by the Panels for the following panel projects:

Eldorado Nuclear Ltd. - Expansion of Uranium Refinery Capacity.

Polar Gas Project

Mackenzie Delta Gas Gathering System

Mackenzie River Dredging Program

Shakwak Project (Haines Road/Alaska Highway)

Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project

Expansion of Air Traffic Capacity of Vancouver International Airport

Fraser River Training Works Program

Roberts Bank Bulk Loading Facility Expansion

South Yukon Transportation Study

Eastern Arctic Offshore Exploratory Drilling

Reactivation of Boundary Bay Airport.

6. Panel reports to the Minister of the Environment on the following Panel Projects:
 1. Nuclear Power Station at Point Lepreau, New Brunswick (May 1975)
 2. Hydro Electric Power Project, Wreck Cove, Cape Breton Island, N.S., (August 1976)
 3. Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline Project, Yukon Territory Interim Report. (August 1977).
 4. Eldorado Uranium Refinery Proposal, Port Granby, Ontario. (May 1978)
 5. Shawkak Highway Project, Yukon, (June 1978).
 6. Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling - South Davis Strait Project. N.W.T. (November 1978).
 7. Lancaster Sound Drilling, N.W.T. (February, 1979.)
 8. Eldorado Uranium Hexafluoride Refinery in Ontario. (February, 1979).