

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS

REGISTER OF PANEL PROJECTS

**OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN
FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW OFFICE
HULL, QUEBEC K1A 0H3
JANUARY, 1981**

© Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1981

Cat. No. EN 103-5/1981-14

ISBN O-662-51 182-4

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 (Northern Component).....	6
Arctic Pilot Project (Nova Scotia Component).....	8
Arctic Pilot Project (Quebec Component).....	9
Banff National Park Highway Project.....	10
Beaufort Sea Hydrocarbon Development.....	11
Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling . North Davis Strait Project.....	12
Fraser River Shipping Channel.....	13
Grand Banks . Possible Oil Production.....	15
Lower Churchill Hydro Electric Project.....	16
Norman Wells Oil Field Development and Pipeline.....	18
Shoal Lake Cottage Lot Development.....	20
Slave River Hydro Project.....	21
LIST OF DORMANT PROJECTS.....	22
Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Generation Project.....	22
Dempster Pipeline Project.....	22
Mackenzie Delta Gas Gathering' System.....	23
Polar Gas Project.....	23
Quebec Port Expansion Project.....	24
South Yukon Transportation Study.....	25
Vancouver International Airport - Expansion of Air Traffic Capacity.....	25
LIST OF REVIEWED PANEL PROJECTS.....	26

INTRODUCTION

This publication provides public and private agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public with information on the projects submitted to the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office for formal review, under the Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP).

The contents are arranged as follows:

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

This section contains either the project title, the identification of the proponent and/or initiator, the project description, its status under EARP, the Panel Members and the future events, or, when the review is completed, the project title, the identification of the proponent and/or initiator and the summary of the Panel Report to the Minister of the Environment.

- 3. List of Dormant Projects**

This section contains the project title, the identification of the proponent and/or the initiator, the project description and the name of the person to contact for further information.

- 4. 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.

- 5. General Information on Publications**

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 Organisation 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 Review Office
13th Floor, Fontaine Bldg., Hull, Quebec K1A 0H3

and

Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office
700 - 789 West Pender Street
Vancouver, British Columbia V6C 1H2

ALASKA HIGHWAY GAS PIPELINE PROJECT

Proponent: Foothills Pipe Lines (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 in the Southern sector of the Yukon Territory, 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).

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:

E. R. Cotterill, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

O. Hughes
Energy, Mines and Resources
Calgary, Alberta

C. E. Wykes
Environment Canada
Whitehorse, Yukon

R. G. Morrison
Indian Affairs and Northern
Development
Hull, Quebec

D. S. Lacate
Environment Canada
Vancouver, B.C.

L. Chambers
Yukon Territorial Government
Whitehorse, Yukon

Executive Secretary to the Panel: P.J.B. Duffy, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

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 preliminary 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 second 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. The Panel will recommence the public review after receiving the required information from Foothills. Following the review, the Panel will report to the Federal Minister of the Environment on the adequacy of environmental planning on the project.

ARCTIC PILOT PROJECT
(Northern Component)

Initiators: Department of Indian and Northern Development and
Petro-Canada

Proponent: Petro-Canada

Summary of the Panel report to the Minister of the Environment (Report no.
14, October 1980)

The Arctic Pilot Project would involve the production and liquefaction of 6.4 million cubic metres (225 million cubic feet) of natural gas per day from the Drake Point field on Melville Island and its shipment to eastern Canadian markets in icebreaking tankers. The Environmental Assessment Panel has reviewed the northern component of the project which includes the facilities on Melville Island, and shipment of liquified natural gas by two icebreaking carriers through Parry Channel, and south through Baffin Bay and Davis Strait to the approaches to a southern Canadian terminal.

In January, 1979, an Environmental Statement was issued by the Arctic Pilot Project. This document along with a Socio-economic Statement supplementary information requested by the panel served as input to the review of the project.

The Panel solicited comments on the project from the public and from government agencies and in April, 1980, held public meetings in the communities of Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, Grise Fiord and Resolute which are located in the area of the proposed shipping route. The Panel considered issues relating to the project rationale, long-term implications, the development on Melville Island, the shipping aspects and the overall impact on the human environment. After carefully considering the information presented, the Panel reached a number of conclusions and has formulated certain recommendations which are contained in this report.

The Panel's review has led to the conclusion that the project as presented is environmentally acceptable provided certain conditions are met.

The Panel recognizes that this project would be a "pilot" project in the sense that it would pioneer year-round arctic transportation and develop in Canada a greater arctic expertise within industry and government. It also recognizes that year-round shipping of oil or gas on a much larger scale is being considered by others and that there is a paucity of information on potential impact in some areas in spite of the effort made by the Proponent in preparation for this review. The Panel believes that the relatively small-scale shipping proposal by the Arctic Pilot Project would permit further study and allow more accurate assessment of potential impacts and ways to minimize or determine more fully the effects of large scale shipping.

Parry Channel supports a biologically rich community of birds and mammals, many of which are considered to be of national and international importance. Traditional harvesting of natural resources by Inuit for home-use and income is still important in this region. It is essential, therefore, that ships be routed to avoid environmentally sensitive areas in Parry Channel and that advantage be taken of the pilot nature of this project to monitor and research the effects of year-round shipping in the Arctic. In the Panel's opinion, this can only be achieved through the formation and effective operation of a control authority by the Minister of Transport. The authority would monitor ship movements and enforce good seamanship and appropriate environmental regulations such as those now in existence under the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act.

Advantage should be taken of the long lead time required for the project to become operational to establish the control authority with a view to having an integrated routing system in place to deal with future ship traffic. To assist the control authority further, the Panel recommends that the Departments of Environment and Fisheries and Oceans establish an advisory committee which would recommend and approve studies necessary to allow biological information to be effectively integrated into the route selection process. Membership on this committee should include the Proponent, Inuit, the territorial government and other federal departments. Without further research on marine mammals, guided by the advice of Inuit and of government scientists and without a monitoring and control mechanism for the selection of the shipping routes, the Panel is unable to recommend that the project is environmentally acceptable.

The Panel has also recommended a number of specific conditions relating to the Drake Point facilities, Melville Island pipeline, Bridport Inlet facilities, shipping and the human environment as a result of its assessment of the Arctic Pilot Project.

ARCTIC PILOT PROJECT
(Nova Scotia Component)

Proponents: Petro-Canada and Trans Canada Pipelines

Contact: Menno Homan, 9.0. Box 2844, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 3E3

Description

As part of the review of the Arctic Pilot Project a joint federal/provincial Panel will be reviewing the proposed terminal and regasification facilities at Melford Point, Nova Scotia, as well as the shipping route leading to it.

Status under EARP

The Panel is presently being formed.

Future Events

Announcements on the Panel members and timetable for the review will be announced shortly.

ARCTIC PILOT PROJECT
(Quebec Component)

Proponents: Petro-Canada and Trans Canada Pipelines

Contact: Menno Homan, P. O. box 2844, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 3E3

Description

As part of the review of the Arctic Pilot Project a joint federal/provincial Panel is reviewing the proposed terminal and regasification facilities at Gros Cacouna, Quebec, as well as the shipping route leading to it.

Status under EARP

Panel formed November 1980. Members are:

M Lamontagne, Chairman
Bureau d'audiences publiques
sur l'environnement
Quebec, Quebec

L. Ouimet
Bureau d'audiences publiques
sur l'environnement
Montreal, Quebec

M Yergeau
Bureau d'audiences publiques
sur l'environnement
Montreal, Quebec

3. Klenavic
Federal Environmental
Assessment Review Office
Hull, Quebec

Dr. G. Drapeau
Oceanology Research Centre
Rimouski, Quebec

Future Events

Public meetings will be held in Rivière du Loup in two parts. The first part which will serve as information meetings will be held on January 14, 15 and 16. The second part which will be concerned to receive submissions and views from the public and government agencies will be held on February 17, 18, 19 and 20.

BANFF NATIONAL PARK HIGHWAY PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

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 Trans-Canada Highway in Banff National Park from the eastern gate to Healy Creek. (27 kilometres) to resolve traffic flow problems including increase to 4 lanes and interchange modifications.

Status under EARP

The project was referred for Panel review in May 1978. Following receipt of an EIS for km 0 to km 13, the Panel prepared a report on this section to the Minister of the Environment (Report no. 11, Banff Highway Project, East Gate to km 13, October 1979). Review of km 13 to 27 will be completed following receipt of an other EIS.

Panel members are:

P.J. Paradine, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

W.R. Binks
Professional Engineer
Ottawa, Ontario

J.S. Tener
Former ADM Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario

J. Hartley
Parks Canada Western Region
Calgary, Alberta

W. Ross
University of Calgary, Alberta

Executive Secretary to the Panel: **Guy Riverin, FEARO, Hull, Quebec**
K1A 0H3 (819) 9974000

BEAUFORT SEA HYDROCARBON DEVELOPMENT

Proponents: **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.

Status under EARP

The project was referred for a Panel review on July 22, 1980. The Panel has yet to be formed.

Executive Secretary to the Panel: D.W.I. Marshall, 700-789 West Pender St. Vancouver, B.C., V6C 1H2 (604) 666-2431

Future Events

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

EASTERN ARCTIC OFFSHORE DRILLING - NORTH DAVIS STRAIT PROJECT

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 hydrocarbons in the waters off the north-eastern coast of Raffin Island in the Eastern Arctic.

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, Chairman
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Hull, Quebec

E.J. Sandeman
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
St. John's, Newfoundland

M. 3. Morrison
Dept. of Indian and Northern Affairs
Yellowknife, NWT

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R. L. Greyell, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

Future Events

It is expected that additional members will be added to the Panel and that supplementary guidelines will be issued dealing with social impact.

FRASER RIVER SHIPPING CHANNEL

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 of the Fraser River Estuary, New Westminster to Georgia Strait (Vancouver, B.C.), 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.

Status under EARP

Panel formed July 1976. Members are:

D.W.I. Marshall, Chairman
FEARO
Vancouver, B.C.

F.C. Boyd
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Vancouver, B.C.

K. Kupka
Environment Canada
West Vancouver, B.C.

J.P. Sector, Manager
British Columbia Ministry of
Environment
Victoria, B.C.

J.W. Wilson
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, P.C.

S.O. Russell
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.

(please turn)

Future Events

The full scheme EIS is expected to be submitted to the Panel in 1981 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.

POSSIBLE OIL PRODUCTION ON THE NORTHEAST GRAND BANKS

Proponent: Mbil Oil of Canada Ltd.

Initiator: Federal Department of Energy, Mines & Resources

Description

Possible oil production on the northeast Grand Banks, east of Newfoundland. (Mbil Oil of Canada Ltd. is currently carrying out exploration drilling for hydrocarbons in the "Hibernia" field).

Status under EARP

Panel partially formed in May 1980. Members appointed are:

Philip J. Paradine, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

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

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

Irene Baird
St. John's Hospital Council
St. John's, Newfoundland

Raoul Anderson
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland

Executive Secretary to the Panel: Guy Riverin, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 9974000

The Panel has issued guidelines to Mbil Oil for its use in the preparation of an EIS.

Future Events

Upon receipt of the EIS (probably in the fall 1981) public and technical agency comments will be sought on the project and the EIS itself, prior to public meetings.

LOWER CHURCHILL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Proponent: Lower Churchill Development Corporation (L.C.D.C.)

Initiator: Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources

Summary of Panel Report to the Minister of the Environment (Report no 15, December 1980).

This report results from a review by an Environmental Assessment Panel of a proposal to build power generating stations on the Lower Churchill River and associated transmission lines across Newfoundland and Labrador. The Proponent of the project, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation (LCDC) is a crown corporation with shares owned by Canada and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The federal agency involved in funding of LCDC, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, requested this review in accordance with its responsibilities under the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP).

Following the formation of LCDC in 1978, the Environmental Assessment Panel was requested to consider both the transmission lines component and potential power generating sites at Muskrat Falls and Gull Island. Environmental Impact Statements were completed by the Proponent by early 1980. After soliciting comments from government agencies and the public, the Panel held public meetings in seven communities in Newfoundland and Labrador during September 1980.

After careful consideration of all information received, the Panel reached a number of conclusions and formulated certain recommendations contained in this report. The Panel found that the project could be acceptable, provided certain environmental and socio-economic conditions are met.

The Panel concluded that the use of the land and wildlife by Indians in Labrador would continue to be a viable option during and after construction of the project. However, special measures affecting local communities will be necessary because of the potential for social disruption resulting from an influx of construction workers.

The Panel concluded that the proposed project will not necessarily lead to other developments in Labrador. However, the Panel strongly recommends that, should specific industrial developments be proposed in the future, the potential for negative effects, and in particular impact on native cultures, be fully assessed prior to irrevocable decisions being made.

Specific conditions have been established to mitigate or compensate for various environmental effects. These address fisheries, forestry, wildlife and other impacts, particularly in the areas to be flooded by the proposed reservoirs. Certain conditions have also been established for the crossing of the Strait of Belle Isle and for the transmission lines generally.

Opportunities exist to construct portions of the project in alternative ways which may have greater long-term resource benefits. Accordingly, recommendations have been made on the salvage of timber from the proposed reservoirs and the use of existing transmission line routes.

The Panel considers that the development of this indigenous renewable energy source is a rational choice to meet demonstrated needs. However, to ensure that local economic benefits are optimized, establishment of liaison committees will be necessary. Specific measures such as training will also be required to increase local employment.

NORMAN WELLS OIL FIELD DEVELOPMENT AND PIPELINE

Proponents: Esso Resources Limited and Interprovincial Pipelines Limited

Initiator: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

Summary of Panel Report to the Minister of the Environment (Report no 16, January 1981)

The Norman Wells Environmental Assessment Panel has reviewed the proposal by Esso Resources Canada Ltd. and Interprovincial Pipe Lines (N.W) Ltd. to expand oilfield production at Norman Wells, N.W.T. and to construct a 324 mm diameter pipeline from there to Zama, Alberta. Oilfield development would include construction of six artificial islands in the Mackenzie River and the 866 km pipeline would transport crude oil and natural gas liquids to markets in southern Canada.

The Proponents issued an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in April 1980. The EIS and additional information requested by the Panel served as the body of information for the review of the Project.

The Panel sought comments on the proposed project from the public and from technical reviewers. In August, 1980, the Panel held public meetings in 12 communities in the project area. The Panel considered issues relating to the rationale for the project, the potential impacts of both the physical environment on the project and the project on the physical and human environment, government preparedness and project monitoring. After carefully considering the information presented, the Panel reached a number of conclusions and made recommendations which are contained in this report.

The Panel's review of the project has led to the conclusion that before the Norman Wells Oilfield Expansion and Pipeline Project can be built within acceptable limits of environmental and socio-economic impact, important deficiencies in the Proponents' planning and in the preparedness of government need to be rectified. This conclusion has led the Panel to recommend that the project not be proceeded with until 1982 at the earliest, in order that these deficiencies can be dealt with.

Esso's oilfield development plan at Norman Wells presents a number of unique technical questions. The Panel reviewed potential problems associated with the construction of artificial islands in the Mackenzie River, fisheries and wildlife concerns relating to island construction and drilling operations, oilspill prevention and counter-measures, toxic substances, air emissions, water use and drilling waste disposal. In the Panel's opinion, additional time is required by Esso Resources Canada Ltd. to solve potential problems of scour around the artificial islands, filter cloth deterioration, contingency planning for oilspills in ice-covered and ice-infested water, oil-leak detection capability, as well as storage, transportation and disposal of toxic and hazardous materials, including contaminated drilling wastes.

The proposed IPL pipeline is in the zone of discontinuous permafrost from Norman Wells to Zama. The Panel concluded that IPL's thermal analysis raises questions of pipeline integrity and right-of-way stability and the Panel has made recommendations for priority research in this subject. The Panel has also made recommendations on planning of river crossings, contingency planning in karst terrain, revegetation and erosion control, and on pipeline routing in the vicinity of native communities.

The Panel's assessment of economic and social issues concentrated on the concerns of the residents and organizations in the project area and the concerns of government agencies at the federal, territorial and local levels. The Panel concluded that the project will provide a needed economic stimulus to the Mackenzie Valley. The recommendations are intended to be carried out in a way to support this conclusion and, in particular, to insure that economic benefits are realized through local employment and business opportunities.

The project impacts on society can be made to be within acceptable limits and the Panel recommendations are aimed at minimizing social disruption. The Panel has concluded that a 1982 start-up on the project could provide time for undertakings on inflationary effects on the economy, wage differentials, a data base for social and health care services, co-operation between the Proponents and government, and adjustment of government priorities to put programs and staff in place.

The report considers but does not recommend on two over-riding political issues which have a major influence on the project, namely the Dene Land Settlement question and resource revenue-sharing between governments.

In its assessment of the project in relation to the Indian people of northwestern Alberta, the Panel recommended that the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development should take the initiative in identifying the agencies to address terms and conditions put forward by the Dene Tha Band, and in coordinating the response to them

SHOAL LAKE COTTAGE LOT DEVELOPMENT

Initiator: Department of Indian & Northern Affairs

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

Proponent: Shoal Lake Band No. 40

Description

The proposed project is located at the northwest corner of Shoal Lake on the Manitoba-Ontario border (Shoal Lake Indian Reserve 40). The proponent has proposed construction of approximately 350 cottage lots on the peninsula between Snowshoe Bay and Indian Bay. Shoal Lake is the source of water for the city of Winnipeg.

Status under ERRP

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

Panel formed January 1981:

R.G. Connelly, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

Dr. Lance Roberts
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

David Witty
Hilderman, Feir, Witty and Associates
Winnipeg, Manitoba

William Ward
Winnipeg, Manitoba

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.L. Greyell, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 9974000

Future Events

Draft guidelines for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement have been prepared and issued by the Panel. The Panel is inviting comments on the guidelines by February, 1981.

SLAVE RIVER HYDRO PROJECT

Initiator: Parks Canada, Department of the Environment

Contact: Mr. W Douglas Harper, Director, Prairie Region, Parks Canada,
114 Garry Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba. R3C 1G1

Description

- 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.
- 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.

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 is:

P.J.B. Duffy, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

Executive Secretary to the Panel: R.L. Greyell, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (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. Panel appointments will be made shortly following discussions with the Governments of Alberta and of the Northwest Territories.

BAY OF FUNDY TIDAL POWER GENERATION PROJECT
Dormant

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

Description

A study entitled "Reassessment of Fundy Tidal Power" dated November 1977 has been released by the initiator and provides a detailed description of the proposed project Chignecto Bay and Minas Basin sites, (upper Bay of Fundy, New Brunswick/Nova Scotia) 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.

For information: Phil Paradine, FEARO, Hull, Que. K1A 0H3 (819) 9974000

DEMPSTER PIPELINE PROJECT
Dormant

Proponent: Foothills Pipe Lines (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.

For information: R. L. Greycll, FEARO, Hull, Que. K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

MACKENZIE DELTA GAS GATHERING SYSTEM

Dormant

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

Description

Construction and operation in the Mackenzie River Delta Region (N.T.) 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).

For information: R.L. Creyell, FEARO, Hull, Que. K1A 0H3 (819) 9974000

POLAR GAS PROJECT

Dormant

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 (N.W.T. portion)

Contact: M Ruel, DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Hull, Quebec

Department of Energy, Mines and Resources (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 Islands, 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.

For information: R.G. Connelly, FEARO, Hull, Que. K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

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

Initiator: National Harbours Board, Department of Transport.

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

Description

The project is located downstream from Quebec City, the left bank of the St. Lawrence below the mouth of the Saint-Charles River. 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).

For information: Carol Martin, FEARO, Hull, Que. K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

SOUTH YUKON TRANSPORTATION STUDY
Dormant

Initiator: Federal Department of Transport

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

Description

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. 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).

For information: P. Scott, FEARO, 700-789 West Pender St., Vancouver,
B.C. V6C 1H2 (604) 666-2431

EXPANSION OF AIR TRAFFIC CAPACITY OF VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
Dormant

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, Richmond, 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.

For information: P. Scott, FEARO, 700-789 West Pender St., Vancouver,
B.C., V6C 1H2 (604) 666-2431

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. Shakwak 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. Eldorado Uranium Refinery, R.M. of Corman Park, Saskatchewan
Report to the Minister, July 1980
14. Arctic Pilot Project, (Northern Component) N.W.T.
Report to the Minister, October 1980
15. Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Project
Report to the Minister, December 1980
16. Norman Wells Oil Field Development and Pipeline
Report to the Minister, January 1981