ANNEX 1: Advice to the Agency

Table 1: Please use the table below to provide advice for the Agency's consideration in its recommendation to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and preparation of draft conditions

Questions	Responses/Comments	
Has the proponent described all project components and activities in sufficient detail to understand all relevant project-environment interactions? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	Transport Canada (TC) determined that it is not likely to exercise any power, or perform any duty or function that will permit the project to proceed. The potential project-environment interactions that may relate to TC's mandate have been sufficiently described by the Proponent.	
	No additional information is required at this time.	
 Were the study areas sufficient to predict potential effects from all relevant project- environment interactions, and to consider the effects within a local and regional context? 	As it relates to Transport Canada's mandate and similar to other Offshore Exploration Drilling (OED) project reviews, it would appear	
 Is the baseline information sufficient to characterize the existing environment, predict potential effects and obtain monitoring objectives? If not, identify what additional information is needed. 	the study areas chosen (local and regional) and the baseline information are sufficient to account for potential project-environment interactions and effects.	
Alternatives Assessment		
 Has the proponent adequately described the criteria it used to determine the technically and economically feasible alternative means? Has the proponent listed the potential effects to valued components (VCs) within your mandate that could be affected by the technically and economically feasible alternative means? 	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.	
 Has the proponent adequately described why it chose each preferred alternative means? 		
 Are there other alternative means that could have been presented? If so, please describe. 		

Questions	Responses/Comments				
Environmental Effects Assessment					
 Has the proponent clearly described all relevant pathways of effects to be taken into account under section 5 of CEAA 2012? Has the proponent identified all potential effects to VCs, including species at risk, within your mandate? Were all potential receptors considered? 	Similar to above (second line) and in consideration of previous OED project reviews, the relevant pathways of effects and potential effects to VCs potentially related to TC's Mandate appear adequately described.				
 Were the methodologies used by the proponent appropriate to collect baseline data and predict effects, why or why not? Has the proponent explicitly addressed the degree of scientific uncertainty related to the data and methods used within the assessment? If there are unaccounted for scientific uncertainties, describe them and indicate the options for increasing certainty in the predictions? 	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.				
 Are the predicted effects described in objective and reasonable terms (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible)? 	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.				
 Has the proponent adequately assessed the potential cumulative environmental effects, including using appropriate temporal and spatial boundaries, examining physical activities that have been and will be carried out, and proposing mitigation and follow-up program requirements? Provide rationale. 	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.				
Has the proponent adequately described the potential for environmental effects caused by accidents and malfunctions, including the types of accidents and malfunctions, their likelihood and severity and the associated potential environmental effects? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.				
 Are you satisfied with the proponent's assessment of effects of the environment on the Project? Has the proponent characterized the likelihood and severity appropriately? Provide rationale. 	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.				
Has the proponent sufficiently described and characterized the project activities and components as they relate to federal decisions within your mandate? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.				

Qu	estions	Responses/Comments
•	Are changes to the environment, as they relate to federal decisions within your mandate, sufficiently described? If not, identify what additional information is needed.	
	Mitigation	
•	Has the degree of uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures been described? If not, identify what information is needed. Is it clear how each proposed mitigation measure links to each potential pathway of effect?	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
•	Would you propose different or additional mitigation measures? If so, provide a description of the mitigation measure(s), with rationale.	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
•	Which of the proposed mitigation measures and/or project design elements do you consider to be necessary to reduce the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects? Provide rationale.	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
	Residual Adverse Environmental Effects	
•	Are the identification and documentation of residual environmental effects described by the proponent adequate? If not, what are the aspects for which there is uncertainty and, where possible, indicate how these residual effects can be best described. If there is uncertainty, what are the options for increasing certainty?	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
•	Did the proponent provide a sufficiently precise, ideally quantitative, description of the residual environmental effects related to your mandate? Identify any areas that are insufficient.	The information in the EIS appears sufficient. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
	Determination of Significance	
•	Are the conclusions on significance in the EIS supported by the analysis that is provided? Are the proponent's proposed criteria for assessing significance appropriate? This includes how the criteria were characterized, ranked, and weighted. Provide rationale. Where the proponent has not used one of the Agency's recommended key criteria (magnitude, geographic extent, duration, frequency, reversibility, and social/ecological context), has a rationale been provided?	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.

Questions	Responses/Comments
Were appropriate methodologies used in developing the conclusions on significance?	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
Do you agree with the proponent's analysis and conclusions on significance? Provide rationale.	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
Monitoring and Follow-up	
Does the proposed monitoring and follow-up program verify the predictions of the environmental assessment as they relate to section 5? Please explain additional monitoring or follow-up needed to address uncertainty in the effects assessment.	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
Does the proposed monitoring and follow-up program verify the effectiveness of proposed mitigations as they relate to section 5? Please explain additional monitoring or follow-up needed to address uncertainty in the proposed mitigation.	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
 Is the objective of the follow-up program clear and measurable? Does the follow-up program include sufficient detail, and technical merit, for the Agency to achieve the stated objective through a condition (e.g. sufficient baseline dataset, monitoring plans, acceptable thresholds of change, contingency procedures)? 	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
 Are you aware of any federal or provincial authorizations or regulations that will achieve the same follow-up program objective(s)? If so, how do these achieve the objective(s)? 	The information in the EIS appears adequate. No further comment as it relates to TC's Mandate.
Additional comments, views, advice	
Provide any other comments.	No further comments at this time. Subject Matter Expertise provided below in Annex 3.

ANNEX 2: Information requirements directed to the proponent

Table 2: Please use the table below to provide your department's comments and suggestions for information that should be required from the proponent to ensure the information in the EIS is scientifically and technically accurate and is sufficient to make a determination of significance on environmental effects.

ID	Project Effects Link to CEAA 2012	Reference to EIS guidelines	Reference to EIS	Context and Rationale	Specific Question/ Request for Information
Create an ID # for each item e.g. CEAA-1, DFO-1	Select the section 5 effect to which your comment applies: 5(1)(a)(i) Fish and Fish Habitat 5(1)(a)(ii) Aquatic Species 5(1)(a)(iii) Migratory Birds 5(1)(b) Federal Lands /Transboundary 5(1)(c)(i) Aboriginal Peoples Health/ socio-economic conditions 5(1)(c)(ii) Aboriginal Physical and Cultural Heritage 5(1)(c)(iii) Current Use of Lands and Resources for traditional purposes 5(1)(c)(iv) any Structure, Site or Thing of Historical, Archaeological, Paleontological or Architectural Significance 5(2) Linked to Regulatory Permits/Authorizations (specify which legislation) If the interaction between the issue of concern and a section 5 effect is unclear, indicate the interaction pathway in the Rationale column.	Identify which section(s) of the EIS Guidelines are related to the comment. e.g. Part 2, section 6.6.1 Effects of potential accidents or malfunctions	Identify which section(s) of the EIS and appendices are related to the comment (Volume, section, page number). e.g. page 78, section 6.6.1 Accidents and malfunctions	Provide applicable background or rationale for requesting the information and why it is important for understanding the effects of the Project or for developing a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of EA predictions or the effectiveness of mitigation measures. e.g. The EIS notes that the modelled flow rate of oil released to the marine environment during the blowout scenarios would decline over the duration of the 30-day release. There was no rationale provided for the declining flow rate in either the main EIS document or the corresponding technical report.	Ask a specific question, or request specific additional information or clarification. e.g. Accidents and malfunctions — Provide rationale for using a declining flow rate in the modelling of the blowout scenarios, or update the analysis to reflect how using a constant flow rate would alter spill modelling results.

${\it ANNEX\,3:\,Advice\,to\,the\,proponent}$

Table 3: Additional advice to the proponent, such as guidance or standard advice related to your departmental mandate

ID	Reference to EIS	Context and Rationale	Advice to the Proponent
TC	Throughout the EISs where transport and supply services by helicopters or vessels is mentioned.	Transport Canada may provide advice/guidance related to shipping and navigation safety, as well as Aviation safety, if required.	TC has determined that it is not likely to exercise any power, or perform any duty or function that will permit the project to proceed.
		3,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Please note the following specialist/expert TC information:
			Transport Canada Marine Safety and Security (TCMSS) has regulatory requirements under the Canada Shipping Act 2001 for Ballast Water Management on board ships and the prevention of pollution from ships. Contact: Mr. Mihai Balaban Manager Compliance and Enforcement Transport Canada, Marine Safety and Security / Government of Canada mihai.balaban@tc.gc.ca / Tel: 902-426-3477 Transport Canada Navigation Protection Program comments: Should plans change and requirements
			necessitate "works" to be undertaken within the bounds of the territorial sea, the Navigation Protection Program (NPP) should be contacted.
			Transport Canada Civil Aviation has the following comments:

	Any helicopter of	perations will need to
		t Canadian Aviation
	Regulations (CAR	s).
	When the oil plan	forms are in port, if
	the total height is	greater than 300 feet
	above water, an	Aeronautical
	Obstruction Clea	rance form will need to
	be completed an	d sent to Transport
	Canada. This is to	assess whether the
	obstruction cons	titutes a hazard to
	aviation safety, a	nd whether lighting or
	marking of the st	ructure would be
	required.	
	Contact:	
	Civil Aviation Services	- Atlantic
	95 Foundry Street	
	P.O. Box 42	
	Moncton, NB	
	E1C 8K6	
	Toll Free Number: 1-8	
	Toll Free Fax: 1-855-7	26-7495
	E-Mail:	
	<u>tc.aviationservicesatl</u>	
	<u>servicesaviationatl.tc</u>	@tc.gc.ca
	Website:	
		eng/civilaviation/menu
	.htm	
_		