

Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process

Register of Panel Projects

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

Number 23, March 1986

CONTENTS

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS:

BRIEF SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PANEL PROJECTS

CN Rail Twin Tracking Program, British Columbia.....	2
Fraser-Thompson Corridor Review, British Columbia.....	3
Point Lepreau Nuclear Generating Station.....	4
Grand Banks-Possible Oil Production.....	5
Shoal Lake Cottage Lot Development.....	6
Slave River Hydro Project.....	7
West Coast Offshore Exploration	8
Military Flying Activities in Labrador and Adjacent Parts of Quebec	9

LIST OF DORMANT PROJECTS

Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Generation Project.....	10
Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling-North Davis Strait Project.....	11
Polar Gas Project.....	12
Fraser River Shipping Channel.....	13
Vancouver International Airport.....	14

LIST OF COMPLETED PANEL REPORTS.....	15
--------------------------------------	----

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS: BRIEF SUMMARY

The 'Environmental Assessment and Review Process Guidelines Order' was issued June 21, 1984, as an Order in Council. These Guidelines, which replace previous cabinet decisions, give detailed effect to the broad responsibilities of the Minister of the Environment stated in the Government Organization Act of 1979.

The Guidelines apply to any federal department, board, or agency and any regulatory body (where there is no legal impediment or duplication). Parent Crown corporations are to participate on the basis of corporate policy and legislative authority.

The Environmental Assessment Review Process (EARP) is applicable to proposals:

- that are to be undertaken directly by the government;
- for which the government makes a financial commitment;
- that are located on federally administered land, including offshore;
- that may have an environmental effect on an area of federal responsibility.

Each department is responsible for the assessment of any proposal for which it has the decision-making authority. It must determine if the environmental effects

of a kind that do not produce any adverse environmental effects, in which case it is automatically excluded from further assessment;

insignificant or mitigatable with known technology; unknown, in which case further study and reassessing will be required;

unacceptable, in which case the project must be modified or abandoned;

potentially significant, in which case the proposal is referred to the Minister of the Environment for public review by a panel. (A public review might also be requested where there is significant public concern.)

The Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office (FEARO) administers the process for the Minister of the Environment and its Executive Chairman is directly responsible to the Minister.

FEARO drafts panel terms of reference and identifies potential panel members for the public review. It provides the panel chairman, when appropriate, and the panel executive secretary and panel secretariat. It also negotiates provincial and territorial participation in reviews and establishes general procedural guidelines for panels.

A public review is conducted by an independent panel, members of which are appointed by the Environment Minister. Members must be unbiased, free of potential conflict of interest and political interest, and have special knowledge and experience. The Minister also issues the terms of reference for each panel. The scope of a review involves the environmental effects and directly related social effects, including those external to Canada. With the agreement of the Environment and the initiating Minister, the scope of a review may be broadened to include such matters as general socio-economic effects, technology assessment, and project need.

Panels issue their own detailed procedures and conduct a public information program to explain the review. The procedures may include matters such as the requirements for guidelines for the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS), the time available for public comment on the guidelines and on the EIS, and the manner in which public hearings will be held. At the end of its review a panel gives a report with conclusions and recommendations to the Environment and initiating Ministers and the report is made public.

The initiating department ensures that decisions made by Ministers are incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of the proposal and that suitable implementation, inspection, and monitoring programs are established. The initiating Minister is responsible for determining the manner of response to the panel's report so that the public is informed of the outcome of the review.

CN RAIL TWIN TRACKING PROGRAM, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Proponent: CN Rail

Initiator: Department of Transport

Contact: L.O. Hostland, Engineer Plant Expansion Program, CN Rail, 10004 - 104 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0K2

Description

The CN Rail Twin Tracking Program involves the construction of double track along 700 km main line from Valemount to Vancouver. The second track would be located adjacent to the existing track and within CN Rail's right of way for most of the line. The main exceptions would be in areas where tunnelling is involved for the second track.

Status under EARP

The project was referred to the Minister of the Environment in December 1982. The Panel, which has formed in April 1983 consists of:

R.G. Connelly, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

Fraser A. MacLean
Victoria, British Columbia

Norman L. McLeod
White Rock, British Columbia

G. Ross Peterson
Howard Paish and Associates
North Vancouver, British Columbia

S.O. (Denis) Russell
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia

The Executive Secretary to the Panel is:
Paul Scott, FEARO, 700-789 West Pender Street
Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1 H2 (604) 666-243 1

The Panel was issued with terms of reference and appointed in April, 1983. The Panel held information meetings along the CN Rail line in June, 1983. Following these meetings, the Panel prepared an Interim Report issued in September, 1983 which, among other things, asked for additional information from CN. The Panel held its final public meetings in June, 1984 in the Vancouver area and community session meetings were held in September, 1984 in Clearwater, Kamloops, Lytton and Chilliwack. The Panel's final report was released by the Ministers of Environment and Transport in March, 1985.

The report contained 41 recommendations directed to CN Rail and federal and provincial agencies. The most significant environmental issue is the potential impact on the fisheries resource. A number of recommendations concern the design and approvals processes. The Panel concluded that, provided these processes continue to function, environmental studies are completed as planned and recommendations regarding the protection of the fishery are followed, the proposed twin tracking program should have little effect on the overall fish resources of the Thompson and Fraser river system. However, the Panel also concluded that the existing design and approvals process was not adequately dealing with all the environmental issues associated with the program, particularly those concerning the Indian food fishery and the protection of heritage resources. The Panel recommended the expansion of the environmental design and approvals process to permit Indian concerns to be considered early in the planning and design of future twin tracking projects. The report also deals with issues associated with train-induced vibrations and noise, toxic spills, wildlife resources, slope stability and track and right of way maintenance. In addition the Panel made a number of recommendations on monitoring and on follow-up activities in connection with the implementation of Panel recommendations.

FRASER-THOMPSON CORRIDOR REVIEW

Initiator: Department of Transport

Contact: P. Hoisak, Department of Transport, Place de Ville, Tower 'C', Queen and Lyon Streets, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0N5

Description:

In April 1983, when the Panel was formed to review the CN Rail Twin Tracking Program in British Columbia, the Panel was also asked to report separately on the long-term environmental implications of transportation related activities in the Fraser and Thompson River Corridors. The Corridor comprises the valleys of the Fraser and Thompson Rivers from Agassiz to Valemount. Transportation activities in the Corridor include those of CN Rail, CP Rail, Ministry of Transportation and Highways, Trans Mountain Pipeline, Westcoast Transmission, Inland Natural Gas, B.C. Hydro (transmission lines) and various forestry development roads.

Status under EARP

Panel members appointed in April 1983 are:

R.G. Connelly, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

Fraser A. MacLean
Victoria, British Columbia

Norman L. McLeod
White Rock, British Columbia

G. Ross Peterson
Howard Paish and Associates
North Vancouver, British Columbia

S. O. (Denis) Russell
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia

The Executive Secretary to the Panel is:
Paul Scott, FEARO, 700-789 West Pender Street
Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1 H2 (604) 666-243 1

As a first step in this review the Panel commissioned Tera Environmental Consultants Ltd. to prepare a report describing the Corridor's transportation facilities

and future development plans, outlining the Corridor's environmental and resource uses and identifying critical areas where transportation activities could affect sensitive resources. A draft of this report was reviewed by government agencies, transportation companies, and public groups and discussed at a workshop in July, 1984.

The Panel in December, 1984, issued a tabloid style handout that summarized the consultant's report, outlined the Panel's review plans, presented a number of issues for discussion and outlined possible options for the future environmental management of the Corridor. This document served as a focus for workshops held in Vancouver, Lytton and Kamloops in March, 1985.

Following these workshops the Panel prepared a discussion paper which outlined the main issues of concern and suggested potential solutions. This paper provided a focus for discussion at a second round of workshops in the same locations in June, 1985.

The Panel reported to Environment Minister Tom McMillan and Transport Minister Don Mazankowski in February, 1986. It recommend that the effectiveness of existing environmental management systems be enhanced by improved co-ordination and co-operation among government departments, transportation developers, and public groups during the planning, design, and construction of new transportation projects in the Corridor. It suggested this should be done by building on existing procedures rather than replacing present ones.

The panel recommend creation of an executive committee with federal and provincial environment and transportation representatives. This committee would provide overall direction for a Corridor management committee of government departments, transportation developers, Indian organizations, public interest groups, and local organizations.

The report also contained recommendations on how resources and their use can be protected, while allowing transportation developments to proceed.

POINT LEPREAU NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

Initiator: Department of Energy, Mines and Resources

Contact: J.D. McTaggart-Cowan, Energy, Mines and Resources, 580 Booth Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0E4

Proponent: Maritime Nuclear (a consortium of New Brunswick Electric Power Commission and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited)

Description

The proposed project consists of a 630 megawatt CANDU nuclear reactor to be built adjacent to the existing Lepreau I unit which is already in operation. The new unit would occupy approximately 11 hectares (27 acres) of the total of 525 (1295 acres) owned by New Brunswick Power at Point Lepreau. The proposed nuclear plant is initially expected to produce electricity for export rather than for domestic purposes.

Status under EARP:

The project was referred for Panel review on July 22, 1983. Because of New Brunswick's interest in this project, a joint federal-provincial review process was initiated. The Panel's terms of reference were issued jointly by the federal and provincial Ministers of the Environment on September 28, 1983. The Panel formed in November, 1983 includes:

R.G. Connelly, Co-Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

Leandre Desjardins, Co-Chairman
University of Moncton
Moncton, New Brunswick

John Foster
Huntsman Marine Laboratory
St. Andrews, New Brunswick

Adrian Booth
Ottawa, Ontario

Executive Secretary to the Panel:
Carol Martin, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

The secretariat held open house sessions in November, 1983 to explain the project, the review process and to hear any initial concerns and issues. The Panel conducted a scoping workshop in December, 1983 in Saint John to identify issues and concerns considered by the public and government agencies to be important for further examination in the course of the review.

In January, 1984, the Panel issued guidelines to Maritime Nuclear for the preparation of an EIS. Maritime Nuclear submitted the EIS to the Panel in June, 1984. After a public review of the EIS, the Panel invited Maritime Nuclear to submit additional information. The Panel received this information in October, 1984 and public meetings on the project were held in November and December, 1984, in Saint John, Fredericton and Pennfield.

The Panel report was presented to the federal and New Brunswick Ministers of Environment in May, 1985 and it was made public in June, 1985. The report concluded that the project could proceed without significant adverse effects, provided certain recommendations are followed. It contains 39 recommendations on a variety of issues including radioactivity, emergency planning, social and economic effects, waste disposal and decommissioning. The Panel considered the actual impacts of the first unit in the process of assessing the incremental impact of Lepreau II. It recommended that steps should be taken now to ensure that potential impacts are reduced to a minimum and that existing concerns about Lepreau I be corrected.

The Panel recommended that emergency plans be improved, by discontinuing the siren warning system, modifying the telephone system, and giving better information to the volunteer wardens. It also recommended that existing monitoring programs be maintained and additional data collected and that a committee of all agencies monitoring the effects of Lepreau I be formed to co-ordinate and report on monitoring programs. The Panel also recommended a community advisory committee be created as soon as possible to provide a forum for exchange of information and problem solving in communities adjacent to the plant site.

OIL PRODUCTION ON THE NORTHEAST GRAND BANKS

Proponent: Mobil Oil of Canada Ltd.

Contact: Wes Abel, Mobil Oil, St. John's, Newfoundland

Initiator: M. Ruel, Director General, Environmental Protection Branch Canada Oil and Gas Lands Administration, 355 River Road, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0E4

Description

The review involved examination of possible oil production on the northeast Grand Banks, east of Newfoundland and the associated on-shore industrial activity.

In March, 1985 following the signing of the Atlantic Accord the original Panel appointed in 1980 was restructured to reflect the joint federal-provincial nature of the review.

Panel members are:

Phil Paradine, Co-Chairman
Science and Technology Canada
Ottawa, Ontario

G. Ross Peters, Co-Chairman
Memorial University
St. John's, Newfoundland

Raoul Andersen
Memorial University
St. John's, Newfoundland

Reverend Father Kevin Molloy
Ferryland, Newfoundland

Winnifred Roebathan-Wells
Lewisporte, Newfoundland

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

Executive Secretary to the Panel:

Bob Greyell, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 997-2244

The original Panel and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador issued Guidelines to Mobil Oil in 1980 for the preparation of an EIS. In May, 1985 Mobil Oil submitted its EIS and in June, the Panel held Information Meetings in ten different communities.

The Panel issued a request for further information to Mobil on August 15 and received a reply in mid-September. Hearings were held in October in six Newfoundland centres. The Panel's report containing fifty recommendations was issued in January 1986. Major recommendations include means of reaching target levels for industrial benefits and a comprehensive training strategy coupled with other measures to ensure achievement of employment goals. Further recommendations include: development of community impact agreements funded by the offshore Development Fund, design requirements for the gravity based production structure to ensure human safety and prevent oil spills, a comprehensive fisheries compensation policy, re-examination of the proposed fisheries exclusion zone, monitoring throughout the life of the project, and the establishment of functional evacuation systems.

The panel also addressed concerns with respect to labour force displacement, affirmative action, population, housing, work camps, waves, seabed stability and seismicity, and seabirds.

Additionally the Panel made seven recommendations related to the review process. These included broadening of the terms of reference, a longer review period for projects of this magnitude, provision of intervenor funding and continuing public involvement.

SHOAL LAKE COTTAGE LOT DEVELOPMENT

Initiator: Department of Indian & Northern Affairs

Contact: E. Harrigan, Director General, Ontario
Region Indian & Northern Affairs Canada 25
St. Clair Ave. E., Toronto, Ont. M4T 1 M2

Proponent: Shoal Lake Band No.40

Description

The proposed project is located at the north-west 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 of the city of Winnipeg.

Status under EARP

The project was referred for Panel review on March 3 1, 1980. The Panel formed in January 1981 includes:

R.G. Connelly, Chairman
FEARO
Hull, Quebec

Lance Roberts
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

William Ward
Winnipeg, Manitoba

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

Philip Gardner
Chief
Eagle Lake Band, Ontario

Executive Secretary to the Panel:
Carol Martin, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A OH3 (819) 997-1000

In February 1983, The Minister of Environment issued the Panel with new terms of reference which focus on the water quality and socio-economic aspects of the project. The March 1981 Guidelines for the preparation of an EIS were amended by the Panel in March 1983 and issued to the proponent. Sufficient copies of an EIS for public and government agency review were received in May 1984. Upon receipt of the EIS, the Panel distributed it for review. Following receipt of comments and on the basis of its own review, the Panel determined that the EIS was deficient and requested additional information from the proponent in August 1984. The proponent's response was received in February 1985 and in March 1985, the Panel concluded that the information was sufficient to proceed to the public meeting stage of the review.

Future events

The Panel has informed the Band that it is ready to conduct the public meetings and is awaiting a response from the Band in order to establish convenient dates for the meetings.

SLAVE RIVER HYDRO PROJECT

Initiator: Parks Canada, Environment Canada

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

Description

The project area is in the area of the Alberta and Northwest Territories border near Fort Smith, N.W.T. and adjacent to Wood Buffalo National Park.

The proposed project would involve construction of a hydroelectric installation near Fort Smith, N.W.T. to develop the potential of the Slave River and a transmission line from the Fort Smith area to Fort McMurray, Alberta.

Status under EARP

This project was referred by Parks Canada for Panel review in January, 1980. Panel members announced in December 1981 consist of:

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

Alistair Crerar
Environment Council of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

William Fuller
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

Alan Loutitt
Yellowknife, N. W.T.

Martin Paetz
Edmonton, Alberta

Executive Secretary to the Panel:
R.L. Greyell, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 997-2244

The Panel issued Draft Guidelines in August 1982 and held public meetings to receive comments on them in October and November.

In April 1984, the Panel, Alberta Environment and the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board issued a draft information requirements document which contained both the Panel's and Alberta's guidelines.

FEARO and the Government of Alberta developed procedures for the review and integrated the Panel and Alberta guidelines.

In August, 1985 the Alberta Government announced that further studies on the project would not take place in the foreseeable future.

Future events

In view of the decision not to proceed at this time the need for the review is being reconsidered.

WEST COAST OFFSHORE EXPLORATION

Federal Initiator: Canada Oil and Gas Lands Administration

Contact: M. Ruel, Director General, Environmental Protection Branch, Canada Oil and Gas Lands Administration, 355 River Road, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0E4

Description:

Chevron Canada Resources Limited and Petro-Canada Inc. have both indicated an interest in petroleum exploration activities off the B.C. coast between the northern end of Vancouver Island and the B.C. /Alaska border. The exploration program would involve seismic exploration in addition to the drilling of some exploratory wells. A moratorium on offshore exploration drilling has been in place since 1972 and would have to be removed before exploration activities could recommence.

Basis of Review:

A Memorandum of Agreement was signed in September, 1983 by the federal and provincial Energy Ministers calling for a joint federal-provincial public review of the environmental and related socio-economic effects of a renewed program of petroleum exploration. The Agreement calls for the review to be operated under a joint framework established under the provincial Environment Management Act and EARP.

Status under EARP

A Panel was formed in June, 1984 reporting to both the federal and provincial Ministers of Environment. In November, 1984, Petro-Canada announced that it

would not be participating in the review, however, Chevron has continued as an active participant. As one of its first tasks, the Panel held a series of public information meetings in November, 1984. Shortly thereafter, the Panel finalized a list of questions to government and industry entitled 'Requirements for Additional Information'. Responses to these questions were received in February, 1985 in the form of two documents, one from Chevron and one from federal and provincial government agencies. These two documents along with the previously prepared Chevron and Petro Canada Initial Environmental Evaluations formed the main information base for the review. The Panel's hearings which are divided into Community Sessions and General Sessions started on September 9, 1985 and finished in November, 1985. The Panel's report is expected in spring 1986.

Panel members are:

E. Cotterill, Chairman, Calgary, Alta.
C. Bellis, Masset, B.C.
P. Gelpke, West Vancouver, B.C.
A. Milne, Sidney, B.C.
N. Nelson, West Vancouver, B.C.

Co-Executive Secretaries to the Panel are:

D.W.I. Marshall, and J.P. Sexter
700-789 West Pender Street
Vancouver, B.C., V6C 1 H2 (604) 666-2431

Future events

Following the hearings, the Panel will complete its report. The report is scheduled to be submitted to the federal and provincial Environment and Energy Ministers in spring 1986.

MILITARY FLYING ACTIVITIES IN LABRADOR AND ADJACENT PARTS OF QUEBEC

Initiator and Proponent: Department of National Defence

Contact: Mr. A.T. Downs, Director, Conservation and Environment, Department of National Defence, 10 1 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K 1 A 0K2

Description

The proposal under review consists of existing low level flight training and a proposed NATO Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre.

The existing low level flight training planned for the summer of 1986 involves the use of the Goose Bay airfield, buildings, facilities, infrastructure, equipment and flying areas. These areas would consist of 100 000 km² of airspace. Between 60 and 75 aircraft making up to 150 sorties daily are at Goose Bay during training periods. Practice target areas for the full range of conventional weapons will also be used by the aircraft.

The Tactical Fighter Weapons Training Centre (TFWTC) would be established in the early 1990's. The

establishment of TFWTC would result in modernization of existing facilities up to 140 aircraft flying about 300 flights a day.

Status under EARP

The project was referred for a public review on February 13, 1986. The project is subject to the EARP. However, some of the flying activities would be conducted over territory regulated by the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. Steps are being taken to ensure that requirements of both the EARP and the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement are followed in the environmental assessment review of this proposal.

For information:

Mr. Carol Martin,
Federal Environmental Assessment
Review Office
Hull, Quebec
Tel: (8 19) 997-22 12

BAY OF FUNDY TIDAL POWER GENERATION PROJECT

Dormant

Initiator: Bay of Fundy Tidal Power Review Board,
R. H. Clark 997-2 108

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. In early 1982, the Tidal Power Corporation released a study entitled 'Fundy Tidal Power-

Update 82'. The goal of this study was to update the economic status of tidal power in accordance with present perceptions of the energy future.

Status under EARP

The initiating department, Energy, Mines and Resources, requested in November 1985, that this review be terminated.

For information:

David Barnes, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 997-1000

EASTERN ARCTIC OFFSHORE DRILLING – NORTH DAVIS STRAIT PROJECT

Dormant

Proponent: Petro-Canada

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

Initiator: Department of Indian and Northern Affairs

Contact: DINA, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Hull,
Quebec, K 1 A 0H4

For information:

R.L. Greyell, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819 997-2244)

Description

Exploratory drilling for hydrocarbons in the waters off the north-eastern coast of Baffin Island in the Eastern Arctic.

POLAR GAS PROJECT

Dormant

Proponents: Polar Gas Consortium and Panarctic Gas Ltd.

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

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.

Status under EARP

The initiating department, Indian and Northern Affairs, requested in May, 1985, that this review be terminated because of substantial changes to the original proposal.

For information:

R. Greyell, FEARO, Hull, Quebec
K1A 0H3 (819) 997-2244

FRASER RIVER SHIPPING CHANNEL

Dormant

Initiator: Public Works Canada

Contact: E.O. Isfeld, Marine and Civil Engineering,
Public Works Canada, 1166 Alberni St.,
Vancouver, B.C. V6E 3Z5

Description

Public Works Canada's original proposal for improvements to the shipping channel in the Lower Fraser River, from New Westminster to the Strait of Georgia, involved the installation of river training walls at five separate locations. These structures were designed to

enable the river to become primarily self-scouring and provide for a 12.2 m shipping channel. Cost-benefit studies indicated that this proposal was not economically attractive. Public Works planning for this project then shifted to a revised scheme involving structures at only two locations and providing for a 10.7 m shipping channel.

For information:

Paul Scott, FEARO, 700-789 West Pender St.
Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1 H2 (604) 666-243 1

VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Dormant

Initiator: Transport Canada, (Canadian Air Transportation Administration)

Contact: L. Rogers, Vancouver International Airport, Vancouver, B.C., V7B1T6

Description

Construction and operation of a third runway at Vancouver International Airport to improve the aircraft

handling capability. The third runway is to be parallel to the main east-west runway and constructed entirely within the Sea Island dykes.

For information:

P. Scott, FEARO, 700-789 West Pender St.
Vancouver, B.C., V6C1H2 (604) 666-243 1

Panel Reports

1. Nuclear Power Station at Point Lepreau. New Brunswick, (May 1975)
2. Hydro Electric Power Project, Wreck Cove, Cape Breton Island. Nova Scotia, (August 1977)
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 Territory – British Columbia. (June, 1978)
6. Eastern Arctic Offshore Drilling – South Davis Strait Project. N.W.T. (November, 1978)
7. Lancaster Sound Offshore Drilling Project. N. W.T. (February, 1979)
8. Eldorado Uranium Hexafluoride Refinery. Ontario. (February, 1979)
9. Roberts Bank Port Expansion. British Columbia. (March, 1979)
10. Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline, Yukon Hearings. (August, 1979)
11. Banff Highway Project (east gate to km 13). Alberta. (October, 1979)
12. Boundary Bay Airport Reactivation. British Columbia. (November, 1979)
13. Eldorado Uranium Refinery, R.M. of Corman Park. Saskatchewan (July, 1980)
14. Arctic Pilot Project (Northern Component). N. W.T. (October, 1980)
15. Lower Churchill Hydroelectric Project. N. W.T. (January, 1981)
16. Norman Wells Oilfield Development and Pipeline Project. N.W.T. (January, 1981)
17. Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline. Yukon Territory. (July, 1981) (Routing Alternatives Whitehorse/Ibex Region)
18. Banff Highway Project (km 13 to km 27). Alberta. (April, 1982)
19. Beaufort Sea Hydrocarbon Production Proposal. (Interim Report) (April, 1982)
20. CP Rail Rogers Pass Development. British Columbia. (Final Report) April, 1982)
21. Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline. Yukon Territory. (Final Report) (October, 1982)
22. CP Rail Rogers Pass Development. British Columbia. (Final Report) (August, 1983)
23. CN Rail Twin Tracking Program. British Columbia. (Interim Report)
24. Venture Development Project. Nova Scotia. (December, 1983)
25. Beaufort Sea Hydrocarbon Production and Transportation. (Final Report) (September, 1983)
26. Port of Québec Expansion Project. Quebec. (September, 1984)
27. Beaufort Sea Hydrocarbon Production and Transportation. (Inuktitut Version) (July, 1984)
28. CN Rail Twin Tracking Program, British Columbia (March, 1985)
29. Second Nuclear Reactor, Point Lepreau. New Brunswick (May, 1985)
30. Hi bernia Development Project (December, 1985)
31. Fraser Thompson Corridor Review (January, 1986)