

### **3.0 INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION AND COORDINATION**

Public consultation is a key component of a comprehensive study and is regulated under CEAA. It provides a means to integrate citizens into the environmental decision-making process and to provide proponents and regulators with the information they need for good decision-making. Specific consultations focus on stakeholders and are meant to gather relevant information and opinions at various stages of the comprehensive study process.

Keltic’s consultation plan specifies the goals of the EA consultation process, describes the relevant communities, identifies which elements are to be carried out by whom, and how results are going to be integrated with the information provided by Keltic’s public communications work. A liaison committee was established by Keltic to provide information to stakeholders and the public, and also to provide feedback from the local community about concerns and advice for consultations.

#### **3.1 FEDERAL COORDINATION**

On October 26, 2004, the Agency forwarded the federal departments’ responses pursuant to the Regulations Respecting the Coordination by Federal Authorities of Environmental Assessment Procedures and Requirements. These determinations were made by all departments to which the Project description (dated August 30, 2004) was circulated. EC subsequently revised its determination and is participating in the process as an expert department based on additional information provided by Keltic.

A listing of responses from these federal departments is provided in Table 3.1-1.

**TABLE 3.1-1 Summary of Federal Departments’ Responses**

<b>Department</b>	<b>Response</b>
EC	Likely to require an environmental assessment; and is in possession of specialist or expert information
DFO	Likely to require an environmental assessment; and is in possession of specialist or expert information
Health Canada	In possession of specialist or expert information
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)	Not likely to require an environmental assessment
Industry Canada	Not likely to require an environmental assessment
National Energy Board	Not likely to require an environmental assessment
NRCan	In possession of specialist or expert information
Parks Canada	Not likely to require an environmental assessment
TC	Likely to require an environmental assessment; and is in possession of specialist or expert information

#### **3.2 PUBLIC CONSULTATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT (CEAA)**

At the federal level, public participation in conducting comprehensive studies is one of the core objectives under CEAA. RAs are expected to understand and address the range of public concerns about a project. The Agency emphasizes that the public is not a single entity but

comprised of varied interests (i.e., local residents, environmental groups, business owners), and requires that proponents provide a variety of opportunities for consulting with interested parties. The RAs (i.e., DFO and TC) are also free to request specific consultations to satisfy their requirements under the Act.

These requirements are broad and do not stipulate precisely how consultation should proceed; however, some general themes have developed in terms of expectations for EA consultations:

- Participants should be involved at all stages of the comprehensive study process, from issues scoping onward.
- The public must have enough time to digest information and prepare comments, but the process must stay within a reasonable time frame.
- Different techniques should be used to encourage the widest possible range of stakeholder participation.
- The public consultation program must be well planned and documented.
- Regulators must be satisfied that the Proponent preparing the CSR has made a reasonable effort to incorporate stakeholder information and public concerns into issue scoping, technical analysis, and conclusions.

Further, pursuant to the CEAA, the RA must ensure that public consultation is conducted at the required three points during a comprehensive study. These are:

- during the preparation of the Scoping Document [subsection 21(1)];
- during the preparation of the CSR [section 21.2]; and
- during a review of the completed CSR prior to the Minister's issuance of an EA decision statement (section 22).

### **3.2.1 Section 21 – Public Participation Regarding Proposed Scope of Project**

Public consultation for a comprehensive study is required under Subsection 21(1) of CEAA as follows:

*“Where a project is described in the comprehensive study list, the responsible authority shall ensure public consultation with respect to the proposed scope of the project for the purposes of the environmental assessment, the factors proposed to be considered in its assessment, the proposed scope of those factors and the ability of the comprehensive study to address issues relating to the project.”*

This involves the preparation of a scoping document by the RAs (May 24, 2005) that was posted on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Registry website on June 6, 2005, for review by the public. The RAs posted a notice with respect to the availability of the scoping document for public review on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Registry website on June 1, 2005. The RAs also gave notice in local newspapers on June 1, 2005, (Chronicle-Herald and Guysborough Journal) and June 3, 2005, (Le Courrier de Nouvelle-Ecosse). All notices stated the availability of the document for public review at four community accessible locations. Comments were requested by July 3, 2005.

The results of this public consultation were provided in the Environmental Assessment Track Report completed by the RAs on October 14, 2005. Based on the comments that were received from the public and expert departments and Addendum was issued on January 5, 2006 which stated that; two additional “Possible Environmental Components of Concern” would have to be considered in the EA - aquaculture and tourism. The RAs required that the species at risk environmental component refer specifically to the roseate tern. Contaminants in the environment would have to be quantified by the Project Proponent during the collection of baseline information.

### **3.2.2 Section 21.2 – Public Participation in Comprehensive Study**

Public consultation for a comprehensive study is required under Subsection 21.2 of CEAA as follows:

*“Where a project has been referred to a responsible authority under paragraph 21.1(1)(a), the responsible authority shall ensure that the public is provided with an opportunity, in addition to those provided under subsection 21(1) and section 22, to participate in the comprehensive study, subject to a decision with respect to the timing of the participation made by the federal environmental assessment coordinator under paragraph 12.3(c).”*

Public consultation activities undertaken by the RAs and related to Section 21.2 of CEAA (i.e., consultation during the preparation of the CSR) involved:

- the release of a draft report to the general for public;
- solicitation of public comment through a formal public review period;
- review and discussion of the Project through a public hearing (under the *Nova Scotia Environmental Assessment Act*).

A draft report was released to the public on August 22, 2006 in the form of a draft EA Report generated pursuant to the Nova Scotia Environmental Assessment Regulations under the *Nova Scotia Environmental Assessment Act*. The RAs notified the public of availability of the report for public review via the CEAA Registry (Notice of 14 September).

During the public review period for the Provincial EA Report (August 22 to October 30, 2006) the public had an opportunity to review and comment on the EA. The EA Report was made available in several locations, including:

- The Municipality of Guysborough, Guysborough;
- Sherbrooke Library, Sherbrooke;
- Clean Nova Scotia, Dartmouth;
- NSEL, Antigonish; and
- NSEL, Halifax.

In addition, the report was available on the Nova Scotia government EA website at [www.gov.ns.ca/enla/ess/ea](http://www.gov.ns.ca/enla/ess/ea).

Further opportunity for review and discussion was provided through the Provincial EA hearings, which were held between November 20 and 25, 2006 in Guysborough, Sherbrooke and Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Stakeholders and the general public were invited to provide/present submissions on the Project during the hearing. The general public and stakeholders who wished to provide written or oral presentations to the Environmental Assessment Board were able to do so until November 13, 2006.

Questions, concerns, and comments received by the RAs during the public review process of the EA Draft Report were placed on the public registry and provided to Keltic for response. In addition, further public comments were received during the open sessions of the public hearings.

### **3.2.2.1 Issues Raised During the Public Review**

Key issues identified through the public review included:

- Project sustainability and need;
- facility operation;
- ground water, fresh water, and marine water quality;
- fish habitat and fisheries;
- wildlife;
- birds;
- marine safety;
- human health and safety;
- accidental events; and
- cumulative effects.

The issues raised during consultations or received by mail from non-governmental stakeholders and that are within the scope of this CSR are listed by topic in Table 3.2-1 (Appendix 4, lists issues and concerns raised during the open house sessions).

Federal and provincial authorities also provided comments on the Provincial EA Report. These are addressed in Section 3.5.

**TABLE 3.2-1 Topics Raised Through Nova Scotia EA Board and Public Review**

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Project Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project sustainability</li> <li>• Exclusion zone</li> <li>• Power supplies</li> <li>• Use of LNG onsite &amp; for export</li> <li>• Noise</li> </ul>	2.1./2.1.2/2.4.1/2.4.1.4/2.4.2 2.4.3.2/2.5.2.3 2.2/2.2.1/2.2.2.4/2.2.5.1/ 2.2.5.5/ 2.2.6.4/2.4.1/2.4.1.4/2.4.2.2/ 2.4.2.2 (Alternatives) 2.2.2.1/2.4.1 2.2.4.3 (Monitoring) 2.5.2.3 (Description VEC's)
Project Description: Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquid and solid waste</li> <li>• % of site to be cleared</li> <li>• Management of mine tailings</li> <li>• Nature of bedrock</li> <li>• Foundation construction methods</li> </ul>	2.2.2/2.2.2.5/2.2.4.5/2.2.5.1/ 2.2.5.2/ 2.2.5.6/2.2.6.2/2.2.6.3/2.2.6.5/2.2.7/2.4.1/2.5.2.3 2.2.5.3/ 2.5.5.3 5.1.2.1/5.1.2.2/5.1.4.2/5.1.5.1/ 5.1.5.2/5.1.10.2/5.1.22.1/5.1.22.2/5.2.4.2/5.3.5.2/5.3.11.1 4.1.3.1/4.1.3.4/4.1.8/ 2.2.5.2/ 2.2.5.3/ 2.2.5.5
Project Description: Operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discharges to the environment</li> <li>• Storm-water contamination</li> <li>• Wastewater effluent</li> <li>• Air emissions</li> <li>• Waste product transport</li> <li>• Port operation</li> <li>• Storage &amp; containment of fuel</li> <li>• Flare emissions</li> </ul>	2.5.2.3 2.2.6.5 2.2.3/2.2.4.3 / 2.2.6.2 / 2.5.2.3 2.2.4.3 / 2.5.2.3 2.24.5 2.2.3 2.2.5.1/2.2.6.3 2.2.3/2.2.6.2/2.2.6.5
Project Need/Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project justification</li> <li>• Project sustainability</li> </ul>	2.4 2.1./2.1.2/2.4.1/2.4.1.4/2.4.2
Alternatives to the Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent of consideration of alternatives</li> </ul>	2.4
Project boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporal &amp; spatial boundaries of assessment</li> </ul>	2.5.2.1
Freshwater Quality/Quantity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discharges to freshwater</li> </ul>	5.1.1.2/5.1.2/5.1.10.1/5.1.14.1/5.1.22.1/5.2.4.2
Groundwater Quality/Quantity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on local wells</li> </ul>	5.1.3/5.1.3.1/5.1.3.2/5.1.22.1
Marine Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effect of marginal wharf on marine circulation</li> <li>• Effect from leaching from contaminated sediment</li> <li>• Effect of emissions</li> </ul>	5.2.14 5.1.2/5.1.4.1/5.1.4.2 /5.1.4.4/5.1.5.1/5.1.5.2/ 5.1.10.2/5.2.4.1/5.2.4.2/5.2.5.2/ 5.2.8.1/5.2.10.1/5.3.4..3.5/5.3.5.1/5.3.11.1 5.1.4.

**Keltic Petrochemicals Inc.**  
**Liquid Natural Gas Facilities and Marginal Wharf**  
**Comprehensive Study Report – Final Report**  
**Goldboro, Nova Scotia**  
**October 2007**

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Odour</li> <li>• Air emissions – Project and cumulative</li> <li>• Health risk assessment</li> <li>• Baseline data</li> <li>• Disturbance of mine tailings</li> </ul>	5.1.6, 5.3.6 5.1.6 / 5.2.6 / 5.3.6 5.1.6 / 5.2.6 / 5.1.22 4.1.6/5.1.6.1 5.1.5.2/5.1.22.1/
Climate Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extreme weather</li> <li>• Climate change</li> <li>• Vessel specifications</li> </ul>	4.1.7/9.1 / 9.2.3 / 9.2.4 / 9.2.5 / 9.2.7 / 9.3.3 / 9.3.4 / 9.4.6 5.3.7/9.2.7 5.3.7.2/9.3.5
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significance of impacts</li> </ul>	5.1.8 / 5.2.8 / 5.3.8
Species at Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roseate Tern, Greater Yellowlegs, boreal felt lichen</li> </ul>	5.1.9 / 5.2.9 / 5.3.9
Fish and Fish Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of wharf and vessel operation</li> <li>• Spills</li> <li>• Ballast water</li> <li>• Habitat Compensation Plan and timing</li> </ul>	5.2.10 / 5.3.23 5.2.10 / 5.3.10 5.3.24 5.2.10 / 5.2.23
Marine Mammals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in ship traffic</li> </ul>	5.3.11
Wildlife and Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significance of impacts</li> <li>• Site fencing</li> <li>• Prey/predator balance</li> <li>• Biodiversity</li> <li>• Species at Risk</li> <li>• Mainland moose</li> <li>• Alteration of coastline</li> <li>• Lights &amp; noise</li> </ul>	5.1.12/ 5.2.12/ 5.3.12/ Section 6.0 2.2.5.2 5.1.11.1/ 5.2.9.1/ 5.2.11.1/5.1.12.1/5.2.10.1 5.1.13 5.1.9/ 5.2.9/ 5.3.9/ 6.1-8/ 8.2.1.9/ 8.3.1.9 4.2.3.4/4.2.5/5.1.9 5.1.1/ 5.1.13.1/ 4.2.2.1/ 9..2 5.1/ 5.3.16/ 8.2.1.13/8.1.1.2/5.2.15
Migratory Birds and Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foraging sea birds</li> <li>• Birds</li> <li>• Biodiversity</li> <li>• Loss of habitat</li> <li>• Contamination of food chain</li> <li>• Shipping and accidents</li> </ul>	4.2.3.3 / Table 4.2-14 / 5.2.9/5.3.9/5.3.15/ 6.1.8/6.2.6/6.3.5 4.2.3.3/5.1.13/5.2.13/5.3.13/6.1.1/6.1.12 / 4.3.5.1 5.1.1.4/5.1.14.1 5.1.13. / 6.1.12/6.2.10 10.1.1.3 6.3.8 / 6.3.7 / 5.1.12.1
Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disposal of removed organics</li> <li>• Cultural value of wetlands (medicinal plants)</li> <li>• Extent of wetland loss</li> </ul>	5.1.14 5.1.14 5.1.14
Lighting Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on visual (light) landscape</li> </ul>	5.1.15

**Keltic Petrochemicals Inc.**  
**Liquid Natural Gas Facilities and Marginal Wharf**  
**Comprehensive Study Report – Final Report**  
**Goldboro, Nova Scotia**  
**October 2007**

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Atmospheric and Underwater Acoustic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Effects on visual landscape</li> <li>• Vibration</li> </ul>	5.1.16/5.2.16/5.3.16/6.1.15/ 6.2.13/6.3.10 5.1.16/6.1.15/6.2.13
Physical and Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage &amp; cultural legacy</li> <li>• Marginal wharf site is important to Black Loyalists</li> <li>• Visual impacts on coastline &amp; local community</li> </ul>	5.1.17 5.2.19 5.2.19
Traditional Aboriginal Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts beyond Project site</li> </ul>	5.1.19
Navigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use &amp; access of Country Harbour, Isaac's Harbour &amp; Stormont Bay</li> </ul>	2.2.2/2.2.6/2.4.3/ 5.2.20.1
Marine Safety and Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk to fishermen during storms from LNG vessels</li> <li>• Safety for LNG vessels</li> <li>• History of shipwrecks</li> <li>• Security</li> </ul>	5.2.23/5.3.20/5.2.20 5.3.21/5.3.20/5.3.22 5.2.21/5.3.22/5.3.21
Human Health & Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle collisions</li> <li>• Traffic impacts</li> <li>• Health risk assessment</li> <li>• Air emissions</li> <li>• Communication of health risks</li> <li>• Bio-accumulation of chemicals</li> <li>• Wastewater</li> <li>• Risk from terrorist attacks</li> <li>• Lights &amp; noise</li> <li>• Contaminated sediment</li> </ul>	8.2.1.22 5.1.22.1 5.1.22.1/5.1.22.2/ 5.1.22.3 / 5.2.22 / 5.3.22 5.1.6.1/5.1.6.2/5.1.6.3/5.1.6.4/5.1.22.1/5.2.22.1 10.1.1.3 5.1.22 TERMPOL & QRA Noise: 5.1.16 Light: 5.2.15 / 5.1.15 5.1.22 / 5.2.5 / 5.2.8 / 5.2.10
Fisheries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation with local fishers</li> <li>• Habitat loss</li> <li>• Interference with inshore fisheries &amp; recreational boating</li> <li>• Loss of access</li> <li>• Fisher compensation</li> </ul>	5.1.16.2 / 5.2.23 5.1.10 / 5.2.10 / 5.3.10/5.3.23.2 5.3.23/5.3.20/5.2.23
Aquaculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitation on current and future development</li> </ul>	5.2.23 5.2.10/5.3.23
Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on natural attributes of area</li> </ul>	5.1.24 5.1.25 / 5.2.25
Decommissioning & Reclamation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bonding</li> <li>• Decommissioning plan and responsibility</li> <li>• Bankruptcy of Proponent</li> </ul>	Undertaking EAB11 - Provincial EA Hearing Process 2.2.7 Undertaking EAB11 – Provincial EA Hearing Process

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Accidents & Malfunctions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LNG leaks and results</li> <li>• Risk of Boiling Liquid Expanding Vapour Explosion (BLEVEs)</li> <li>• Specific health and safety analyses to be used</li> <li>• Trucking of liquid wastes</li> <li>• Spill Response Strategy</li> <li>• Communication of risks</li> <li>• Thermal radiation &amp; exclusion area</li> <li>• Footprint for Thermal Exclusion Area</li> <li>• Explosion and fire</li> <li>• Emergency response</li> <li>• Fire fighting capacity and responsibilities</li> <li>• Financial responsibility</li> </ul>	<p>10.1.1.2  10.1.1.2    2.2.4.4/2.2.4.5/10.1  10.1.1.1  10.1.1.4/ 10.1.1.5  10.1  10.1.1.3  2.4.3.2/2.5.2.3  10.1.1.4/ 10.1.1.5/10.1.2  10.2.1.3  10.1.1.4/ 10.1.1.5/ 10.1.2</p>
Effect of Environment on Project (LNG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effect of wave action, storm surge, fog &amp; severe storms on terminal &amp; vessels</li> </ul>	<p>Waves: 9.2.5/9.3.5/9.4.4 Surges, Fog: 9.2.3/9.3.3/9.4.2  Storms: 9.2.3/9.2.5/9.2.7.2/9.3.3/9.3.7.1/9.3.5</p>
Cumulative Effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time period assessed</li> <li>• Cumulative effects level of detail</li> <li>• GHG</li> <li>• Marine operations</li> <li>• Surface water quality and fish habitat</li> <li>• Health impacts</li> <li>• Proposed expansion of Goldboro Industrial Park</li> <li>• Black Loyalist heritage</li> <li>• Mi'kmaq heritage &amp; harvest</li> <li>• Deep Panuke and other offshore/onshore developments</li> </ul>	<p>8.1  8.0  8.3.1.7/8.1.1.2/8.1.1.6  8.2.1.20/8.2.1.21/8.3.1.20/8.3.1.21  Water: 8.1.1.2 Fish: 8.1.6.10/8.2.1.10/8.3.1.10  8.2.1.22/8.3.1.22  8.1.1  8.3.1.18  8.2.1.17/8.2.1.18/8.3.1.17/8.3.1.18/8.3.1.19  8.1.1.6</p>
Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance standards for VECs</li> <li>• Actions to be taken if monitoring demonstrates change in condition</li> <li>• Communications between Project Proponents</li> <li>• Monitoring should include surrounding communities</li> <li>• Fish catch</li> </ul>	<p>7.0  7.2.14    7.2.12  7.2.12/7.2.14    7.2.8</p>



**Keltic Petrochemicals Inc.**  
**Liquid Natural Gas Facilities and Marginal Wharf**  
**Comprehensive Study Report – Final Report**  
**Goldboro, Nova Scotia**  
**October 2007**

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of awareness</li> <li>• Communications between Fishers</li> <li>• Role of Community Liaison Committee (CLC)</li> <li>• Technical language</li> <li>• Community information office during construction</li> <li>• Community involvement in EMP</li> <li>• Nova Scotians should be informed and able to provide comment</li> </ul>	<p>3.0  3.0  3.3.2.1  3.0  7.2.14  3.2.2</p>

### **3.2.3 Section 22 – Public Review of the Comprehensive Study Report (CSR)**

Public consultation for a comprehensive study is required under Subsection 22 of CEAA as follows:

*“(1) After receiving a comprehensive study report in respect of a project, the Agency shall, in any manner it considers appropriate to facilitate public access to the report, publish a notice setting out the following information:*

*(a) the date on which the comprehensive study report will be available to the public;*

*(b) the place at which copies of the report may be obtained; and*

*(c) the deadline and address for filing comments on the conclusions and recommendations of the report.*

*(2) Prior to the deadline set out in the notice published by the Agency, any person may file comments with the Agency relating to the conclusions and recommendations and any other aspect of the comprehensive study report.”*

This review is coordinated by the Agency and allows people to submit comments on the conclusions and recommendations of the report. These comments will be taken into account when the Minister issues a decision.

### **3.3 CONSULTATION MEASURES UNDERTAKEN BY THE PROPONENT**

To date, the Proponent has undertaken several consultations during preparation of the EA. These consultations were designed to provide information about the proposed Project, respond to questions and concerns the public might have, and gather technical information and input into baseline data, impacts, mitigation, and monitoring that could be incorporated into the EAs – both federal and provincial.

The following sub-sections outline the various public consultation activities that have been undertaken by the Proponent and the results of these activities. Most of the consultation activities were not specific to either the federal comprehensive study process or the provincial environmental assessment process. Unless, specifically mentioned, the following descriptions therefore, relate to both assessments.

Also included in the following is information on the underlying objectives of the program and the initial steps taken to identify communities, stakeholders, and interest groups.

#### **3.3.1 Goals**

Underlying goals of the public consultation for the Keltic EA process have been:

- to ensure that issues are correctly identified and defined, and that matters of interest to the affected communities are adequately covered in the studies. This scoping is critical to the efficient completion of the comprehensive study;

- to assist in judging the intensity of Project benefits or impacts;
- to ensure that the opinions of key stakeholders have been elicited;
- to provide the EA team with accurate local information or expert opinions not available through published sources; and
- to fulfill regulatory requirements.

### **3.3.2 Approaches to Public Consultation**

The consultation program of the Keltic Project has applied a combination of activities. Key program components include:

- defining communities, stakeholders, and the public;
- project/scoping backgrounder (hand out material);
- public meetings/ open houses; and
- continued consultation.

#### **3.3.2.1 Defining Communities, Stakeholders and the Public**

Geographically, communities affected by the Project broadly fall into those in the immediate vicinity of the proposed plant and wharf, and those further along the coasts to either side of the Project site. More specifically, they include:

- the communities on the shores of Country Harbour and Stormont Bay, including Drum Head, Goldboro, Isaac's Harbour, and Country Harbour;
- the communities on either side of Stormont Bay from Port Hilford through Port Bickerton to the west, and Coddles Harbour to Tor Bay to the east (in the Municipality of the District of Guysborough);
- the area around Erinville and Salmon River Lake (in the Municipality of the District of Guysborough); and
- the area around Fraser Mills and Lower Springfield (in the Municipality of the County of Antigonish).

Further, given the economic characteristics of the proposed Project, the following economic interest groups were identified at the start of the Project as having a potential interest in the proposal:

- Guysborough County Regional Development Authority (GCRDA);
- Goldboro-Isaac's Harbour Community Development Authority;
- Guysborough County Inshore Fisherman Association (GCIFA);
- Eastern Shore Fishermen's Protective Association;
- individual fishers and aquaculture interests in the Keltic Study Area;
- The Antigonish Area Partnership;

- Antigonish Chamber of Commerce; and
- Antigonish Regional Development Authority.

Groups with an environmental and community focus that may have an interest in the proposed Project were considered to include such organizations as:

- Goldboro and Area Marine Protection Society;
- Ecology Action Centre, particularly their Coastal Issues and Marine committees;
- Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Nova Scotia Chapter;
- Nova Scotia Bird Society;
- The Aquaculture Association of Nova Scotia;
- Eastern Mainland Field Naturalists (based in Antigonish);
- The Sierra Club, Nova Scotia Chapter;
- Coastal Communities Network (based in Pictou); and
- Nova Scotia Salmon Association.

Communities, interest groups, and the public at large were approached via mail and/or media advertisements. Issues raised have been recorded and documented together with the responses provided by the Proponent (see Section 3.3.3).

As a proactive approach, Keltic established a CLC in August of 2004. The committee was set up by Keltic, voluntarily, to involve and inform local communities in the Project and will be the primary vehicle used for future consultations. The CLC has a two-fold mandate:

- to provide a forum for the representatives of the residents of Goldboro and surrounding communities to offer their input on the Keltic Project; and
- to provide a forum for representatives from Keltic to update the community, through the committee, on the various aspects of the Project.

Keltic held a number of open houses and asked attendees if they would be interested in sitting on the committee as a representative. A public meeting chaired by Councillor Derek Hayne was used to select committee members. The committee is structured as follows:

- Goldboro - 2 members;
- Isaac's Harbour – 2 members;
- Drum Head - 1 member;
- Coddles Harbour - 1 member;
- New Harbour - 1 member;
- Stormont - 1 member;
- African Nova Scotian Community - 1 member;

- Municipal Councillor - 1 member; and
- Keltic – 2 members.

### **3.3.2.2 Project/Scoping Backgrounder**

A Project/scoping backgrounder was prepared for the consultation process and was handed out during the open houses. The backgrounder included:

- definition of the EA;
- Provincial and Federal requirements;
- summary of the Project description; and
- a summary of the major environmental issues regarding the proposed plant site and socio-economic conditions.

### **3.3.2.3 Public Meetings / Open Houses**

Consultation with the general public through public meetings/Open House events commenced in 2004 and involved a series of public meetings:

- Country Harbour (July 6, 2004; 30 Nov. 2004);
- Lincolnville (Guysborough), July 7, 2004);
- Antigonish (July 8, 2004);
- Goldboro (Sept. 27, 2004); and
- New Harbour (Nov. 15, 2004).

Purpose of the meetings was generally to introduce participants to the Project and the planning process, and to identify public concerns and obtain input to the baseline studies. Other issues discussed included such topics as materials handling, insurance considerations, and job and training opportunities.

The public meetings were supported by presentation material, Project information pamphlets, and questionnaires. In addition to general advertising on the local radio and in local newspapers such as the Casket (Antigonish) and the Guysborough Journal, direct contacts were made by the consulting team during the preparation of the EA. Large public open houses were held in targeted venues for both the general public and stakeholders. Also, small focus group meetings were held with:

- GCIFA; and
- individual fishermen and stakeholders of the aquaculture industry in the Keltic Study Area.

Subsequently, Keltic held a number of additional public meetings. These meetings/Open House events were in some of the previous locations and in new locations:

- New Harbour (February 21, April 11, May 9; and June 20, 2005);

- Erinville (October 4, 2005);
- Antigonish (October 5, 2005);
- Port Bickerton (October 27, 2005); and
- Goldboro (October 3, 2006).

These meetings were themed to provide information about various aspects of the Project. Emphasis was placed on soliciting public input on key concerns, the scope of the Project and the EA, and to provide a general up date on progress. Events at these five locations are briefly characterized below.

### **New Harbour**

A number of meetings were held by Keltic at the New Harbour School, prior to its closing during the summer of 2005. One meeting focused on socio-economic concerns and the consultation process and was held on February 21, 2005. Over 400 people attended the meeting. A community information session was held at New Harbour School on April 11, 2005. This meeting was an information session to provide an overview of the community consultation process and the economic and social impact analysis process associated with the preparation of the EA. Approximately 100 people attended this session.

The public consultation plan was reviewed, noting that although NSEL had finalized its provincial terms of reference for the EA, the Agency had not yet finished its internal federal department issue scoping at the time. Most of the formal public consultation process that followed occurred after the draft federal scope was released. The socio-economic assessment was discussed, and the data requirements stated.

Following the overview presentations, people in attendance were asked to brainstorm what issues related to the Project are of interest to them. Key issues raised related to such topics as community benefits, employment and training opportunities, transportation, community health and safety, consultation process, land values, property taxes, and Project schedule.

### **Erinville**

The open house held in the Erinville Fire Hall on Tuesday October 4, 2005, provided background information on the environmental setting (including the marine, terrestrial, and socio-economic components) and allowed attendees an opportunity to respond to a short survey.

Erinville was chosen due to its central location between Goldboro and Antigonish. 34 people attended this open house.

Appendix 4, Table 4-1 summarizes the main concerns highlighted during the open house.

### **Antigonish**

This open house, held at the Antigonish Green Way Claymore Inn on Wednesday October 5, 2005, was a companion to the Erinville open house and provided background information on the environment and allowed attendees an opportunity to respond to a short survey.

Antigonish was chosen due to its prominence as a major population and service centre in the region. 16 people attended this open house. Appendix 4, Table 4-2 summarizes the main concerns highlighted during the open house.

### **Port Bickerton**

This open house, held at the Port Bickerton Community Centre on Thursday, October 27, 2005, focused on the proposed FHCP (Appendix 5) being presented by Keltic. Fisherman's Harbour has been proposed as a compensation site for habitat lost due to construction of the Marginal Wharf in Goldboro. The intent of this session was to review the proposed Habitat Compensation Plan with fishers, answer questions, and gather input that could be used to refine the proposal. Port Bickerton was chosen due to its proximity to the Goldboro area and because it is a fishing community. Six people attended this open house, several of which actively fish in Stormont Bay. Appendix 4, Table 4-3 summarizes the main concerns highlighted during this session.

Previous meetings that had been held with fishers who fished specifically within Stormont Bay focused on financial compensation in the event of accidents or disruption to traditional fishing practices within the bay. Concerns had focused on interference from large vessel traffic, loss of access to the marginal wharf area, and potential environmental damage from an accidental spill of hydrocarbons.

### **Goldboro**

The most recent Open House was held at the Goldboro Interpretive Centre in Goldboro on October 3, 2006. Purpose of this Open House was to provide an update on the Project development and environmental assessment process. The meeting was attended by about 150 participants. Key topics discussed with the public related to the Project schedule and upcoming employment and training opportunities. No new issues and concerns beyond those obtained through earlier meetings and Open Houses were identified.

### **Outcome of Public Meetings and Open House Events**

Comments and questions received during the consultation process generally reflected regional economic concerns. For example, most issues raised at the Erinville consultation related to the proposed road alignment and job creation. The Antigonish open house focused more on the regional economic implications of the Project. At the Port Bickerton open house, the focus was the commercial lobster fishery and other marine related issues. The New Harbour open house attracted the most people, and therefore captured a greater variety of issues.

Input from the consultations was used to identify and refine VECs to focus the environmental assessment process. Table 3.3-1 is a summary of the VECs that were captured during the

public consultation process. It is of note that the list includes all VECs identified. The subsequent sections of this CSR only address those VECs relevant to the report's scope (see Section 2.5.2.3).

**TABLE 3.3-1 Valued Ecosystem Components Identified during Public Consultation Process**

<b>Consultation Group</b>	<b>VECs Identified</b>	
CLC	All VECs	
Antigonish	Quality of life Transportation Existing and planned land uses	Human health and safety Community resources
Erinville	Quality of life Existing and planned land uses Human health and safety	Transportation Acoustic environment Community resources
New Harbour	Human health and safety Existing and planned land uses Community resources Fish and fish habitat (marine)	Quality of life Transportation Commercial fisheries
Port Bickerton	Fish and fish habitat (marine) Commercial fisheries Human health and safety	Marine safety and security Navigation Quality of life
Mining Industry	Transportation (Orex requested that the road alignment be shifted to avoid possible land use conflicts)	

#### **3.3.2.4 Continued Consultation**

In addition to the above mentioned review of the CSR, the Proponent has indicated they will continue with a number of consultation activities.

The CLC meets regularly with Keltic and will continue to be used as a sounding board for any issues that arise such as safety, environmental concerns, employment, etc. Keltic will maintain its Project-specific website. This provides for dissemination of information on the progress of the Project and the release of further studies. The web page will inform about upcoming events, employment opportunities, and procurement of goods and services.

Further, Keltic will continue to liaise with the GCRDA and the Guysborough Journal as a means of communicating any information. Keltic will also liaise actively with local emergency service providers, such as Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), fire and emergency health response.

#### **3.3.3 Overview Provincial EA Process and Associated Key Consultation Activities**

The following Table 3.3-2 summarizes the milestone dates and activities as they relate to the public consultation process as implemented by the Nova Scotia provincial government (NSEL) and the Proponent. The dates are provided here for overview purposes and to provide an understanding of the comprehensiveness of the consultation activities undertaken to date. Notices have all been posted and documents been made available through the Nova Scotia government EA website at [www.gov.ns.ca/enla/ess/ea](http://www.gov.ns.ca/enla/ess/ea). In addition, local media were used for notification purposes as discussed in earlier sections.



**TABLE 3.3-2 Provincial EA Process and Milestone Dates Related to Public Consultation**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Milestone</b>
January 12, 2005	Registration Document for Class II Undertaking
January 2005	Notice of Registration of Class II Undertaking and Preparation of Terms of Reference for EA Pursuant to the <i>Nova Scotia Environment Act</i>
April 8, 2005	Terms of Reference As Required by the <i>Environment Act</i> For Preparation of an Environmental Assessment Report
June 20, 2006	Project Status Update - notice of intention to exclude the construction of a 54km 2 lane highway from the Project.
August 2006	Release of EA Report Notice of the Minister of Environment and Labour's receipt of the EA Report from Keltic Petrochemicals and invitation for written comments on or before October 30, 2006.
October 20, 2006	Notice of Hearing
November 14, 2006	Notice of Revised Hearing Dates
November 20-25, 2006	Public Hearings in Guysborough, Sherbrooke, and Antigonish.
December 7, 2006	Notice of request for extension from the Nova Scotia Environmental Assessment Board (NSEAB) being granted, with a new deadline of February 21, 2007.
February 21, 2007	Completion of NSEAB's review and submission to the Minister of Environment and Labour.
March 14, 2007	Notice of Ministers Decision: Approval of LNG and Petrochemicals Facility Project subject to terms and conditions.

### **3.3.4 Consultation Summary**

As part of the EA process, the Proponent has implemented a consultation program. The consultation activities undertaken involved various activities including numerous public meetings, open house events, and meetings with a number of interest groups. The key issues raised during the consultation process encompassed a wide variety of socio- cultural, economic, and environmental topics, such as quality of life, human health and safety, commercial fisheries, marine safety, and road transportation. A summary listing of topics addressed during the process is provided in Section 3.2.2.1. Additional information on concerns raised during the consultation activities is provided in Appendix 4, Tables 4-1 to 4-3. The input received from the general public, stakeholders, and interest groups has been incorporated into the provincial EA Report and this federal CSR document where appropriate.

First Nation communities, and Federal and provincial authorities also provided comments on the Project proposal and the EA process. These are addressed in Section 3.4 and 3.5 respectively.

### **3.4 FIRST NATION ENGAGEMENT**

Communication and engagement with First Nation's groups is on-going and has involved:

- communication with relevant government agencies (INAC, Nova Scotia Department of Aboriginal Affairs);
- meetings with representatives of the Native Council of Nova Scotia;
- a Mi'kmaq Ecological Knowledge (MEK) Study; and
- communication with representatives of the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs.

### **3.4.1 RA Engagement with First Nations**

On August 30, 2004, the Agency distributed the Keltic Project description to INAC who reviewed the document and advised the agency that they were not likely to require an EA (as outlined in Section 3.1, CSR).

On September 13, 2006, CEAA mailed out notifications on of the federal EA (i.e., the CSR) and the availability of the provincial EA Report for public review and comment to:

- Nova Scotia First Nation communities;
- the Union of Nova Scotia Indians;
- the Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq; and
- the Mi'kmaq Environmental Resources Development Secretariat at the Native Council of Nova Scotia.

### **3.4.2 Engagement with First Nations by the Proponent and the Provincial Government**

#### **3.4.2.1 Initial Communication, Engagement, Meetings**

In January 2005, the provincial government distributed the Registration Document to the Nova Scotia Department of Aboriginal Affairs for their consideration. In April 2006, a draft provincial Environmental Impact Statement was distributed by NSEL to a number of provincial government departments including the Nova Scotia Department of Aboriginal Affairs for their review and comment (see comments/responses provided in Section 3.5).

Additionally, in February 2005, Keltic met with Mr. Roger Hunka and Mr. Tim Martin, who are members of the Native Council of Nova Scotia, to discuss the Project.

#### **3.4.2.2 Mi'kmaq Ecological Knowledge (MEK) Study**

To further determine potential interactions of the Project with past and present aboriginal land use, a MEK Study was conducted. Keltic engaged Membertou Geomatics to conduct an MEK Study in the summer and fall of 2005. The purpose of the study was to identify Mi'kmaq land and resource use activities that have been or continue to be pursued by Mi'kmaq in the geographical areas being considered for Project development activities. The study included consultation with First Nation community members and considered surrounding lands within a 10 km radius.

The MEK Study consisted of three major components:

- historical review regarding past Mi'kmaq occupation and use of the area in question;
- assessment of Mi'kmaq traditional land and resource use activities, both past and present; and
- analysis of Mi'kmaq significance species considering the resources that are important to Mi'kmaq use.

The study found that Mi'kmaq continue to undertake traditional activities throughout the Study Area. While some of the reported hunting and fishing areas will be impacted by the construction of the LNG Terminal, most of the areas that will be affected are smaller hunting areas that either encompass large areas of land, or are located throughout areas of the various waterways. The construction activities will only take place on portions of the identified hunting areas and should result in minimal impacts to the land and resources. As well, the data gathered regarding the various resources which are harvested by Mi'kmaq found that although these resources play an important role to Mi'kmaq, the high majority of them are found in other areas either within the Study Area, or in other areas of Nova Scotia.

During the hearings for the Nova Scotia EA process, the Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq provided comments to the Nova Scotia EA Board on the limitations to the completed MEKS. As a condition of the Nova Scotia EA Approval the proponent is required to comply with the following two conditions:

- Prior to construction, the Proponent shall develop a Mi'kmaq Communication Plan for the Project which will include but not be limited to:
  - Processes for communicating Project details and seeking input from the Mi'kmaq community.
  - Plans for Mi'kmaq involvement in environmental effects monitoring (EEM) and other Project aspects. The plan shall be developed in cooperation with the Mi'kmaq Community.
- Prior to application(s) for Part V Approval under the *Environment Act*, the Proponent shall take steps to further assess traditional Mi'kmaq use of the Project site lands. The Proponent shall develop the proposed steps in cooperation with the Mi'kmaq Community and shall submit the results to NSEL.

### **3.4.2.3 Communication and Engagement with Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs**

In October 2006, Keltic was sent a copy of a letter written to the provincial Environmental Assessment Board from Chiefs Lawrence and Terrence Paul, Co-Chairs of the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs regarding a unanimous resolution that was passed by their organization to “call upon the Crowns in the right of Nova Scotia and Canada to consult with the Mi'kmaq about the proposed Liquid Natural Gas Project proposed by Keltic.”

Keltic responded with a letter dated November 6, 2006, to the Honourable Jim Prentice, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Affairs and The Honourable Michael Baker, Q.C., provincial minister responsible for Aboriginal Affairs and copied to Chiefs Lawrence and Terrence Paul. In that letter, Keltic advised the Ministers of the importance of the matters raised by the Assembly and offered to participate in and support any process they deemed necessary to satisfactorily resolve outstanding issues. Keltic asked the Ministers for information on how they plan to move forward. On December 13, 2006, a response was received from the Honourable Jim Prentice advising Keltic that TC and DFO have been identified as the RA in Canada's EA of this Project.

During the provincial EA hearings, representatives from the Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs made a presentation to the Provincial EA Board. During this presentation, they

acknowledged the receipt of Keltic's letter and were encouraged by Keltic's willingness to meet. They further requested consultation with the Crown in the right of Nova Scotia and Canada to consult with the Mi'kmaq about Keltic's proposed Project. In December 2006, the RAs sent a letter to the 13 Nova Scotia Mi'kmaq Chiefs and Councils and the Native Council of Nova Scotia inviting them to discuss the Project and how they would like to consult on any potential impacts.

#### **3.4.2.4 Continued Communication and Engagement with First Nations by the Proponent**

The Terms and Conditions for the Environmental Assessment Approval (NSEL March 14, 2007) that were established by the Nova Scotia Minister of the Department for Environment and Labour include terms and conditions for the Proponent to engage with the Mi'kmaq community prior to construction. In particular, this requires the development of a Mi'kmaq Communication Plan, which will include but not be limited to:

- Processes for communicating Project details and seeking input from the Mi'kmaq community.
- Plans for Mi'kmaq involvement in EEM and other Project aspects. The plan shall be developed in cooperation with the Mi'kmaq community.

Further, in accordance with the terms and conditions, Keltic will take steps to further assess traditional Mi'kmaq use of the Project lands and will develop a proposal for steps to cooperate with the Mi'kmaq community. The results of this will be submitted to NSEL. Also, an archaeology and heritage resources monitoring and contingency plan will be developed in consultation with, Mi'kmaq and other stakeholders.

### **3.5 CONSULTATION WITH EXPERT FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS**

#### **3.5.1 Consultation with Expert Federal Departments**

As discussed in Section 3.1, five federal agencies indicated that they have specialist or expert information relevant to the Project:

- EC;
- DFO;
- Health Canada;
- NRCan; and
- TC.

The above agencies and CEAA reviewed the Provincial EA Report and provided comments and questions. The input received from the agencies was documented in Table 3.5-1 together with the review comments received from the provincial agencies. All questions and comments were reviewed and responses provided. Where applicable, the CSR was generated to reflect the input provided.

### **3.5.2 Comments by Federal and Provincial Authorities on the Provincial EA**

Similarly to the federal agency review of the Provincial EA Report, provincial agencies with an interest in the EA reviewed the document, formulated questions, and provided comments. Input was received from:

- NSEL;
- Nova Scotia Department of Tourism, Culture, and Heritage;
- NSDNR;
- Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Aquaculture (NSDAF); and
- Nova Scotia Health Promotion and Protection.

Table 3.5-1 summarizes the input received together with a reference to the corresponding sections of the CSR that discuss the issues addressed in the review comments. Comments were incorporated into the final version of the Provincial EA Report where applicable and feasible.

**TABLE 3.5-1 Input Received from Federal and Provincial Governments on the Provincial EA Report**

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Project Description: Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duration</li> </ul>	2.2.5
Project Description: Written Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested mitigation</li> <li>Eco-efficiency</li> <li>Cumulative Effects</li> <li>Meteorological and climatological effects on Project</li> <li>VEC concerns</li> <li>Errors in legislation</li> <li>Many section descriptions outside federal scope</li> <li>Needs objectivity</li> <li>Format changes</li> <li>RA input</li> <li>Specify habitat impacts to each source in Project</li> </ul>	5.0 2.2.4.6/2.4.1.3/2.4.2.2 8.0 5.0 and 9.0 2.5, 3.0 and section 5.0 1.0 Throughout CSR Throughout CSR Throughout CSR Throughout CSR 5.0
Additional Documents Requests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EMP</li> <li>EPP</li> <li>EMS</li> <li>FEED</li> </ul>	2.1/2.2.4.1/2.2.4.2 2.2.4.2/2.2.4.1 2.2.4.5 2.1.1/2.2/2.2.2/2.2.5/2.2.6.3/2.2.6.4
Alternatives to the Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent of consideration of alternatives</li> <li>Written Format</li> </ul>	2.0 2.4/2.4.2
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Licenses, easements and permits for Construction of facilities and Highway 316</li> <li>Habitat displacement (mapping requested)</li> </ul>	2.2.3 5.1.10/5.1.12.2/5.1.14.1/5.2.10/5.2.12/5.2.13/5.2.14.3
Population, Economic Conditions, Employment, Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age of educational attainment statistics</li> <li>Training requirements and institutions</li> <li>Employment opportunities to Guysborough residents</li> <li>Inconsistencies between training and construction duration</li> <li>Number employed per phase</li> <li>Impacts to property values</li> </ul>	Sections 2.2.4.2/2.2.4.5/ Sections 2.4.1 and 7.0 2.2.4.5
Fisheries, Aquaculture, and Harvesting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of mercury tailings disturbance to recreational fisheries</li> <li>Compensation to fishermen (earnings)</li> <li>Invertebrates harvesting</li> </ul>	2.5.2.3/3.232.2 4.2.2.1 5.1.23/5.2.10.2 5.1.2.3/5.2.2.3/5.3.2.3
Human Health & Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mercury tailings disturbance and management</li> </ul>	Throughout section 5.0

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Air Quality and Climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emissions characterization and monitoring</li> <li>• Ambient air quality</li> <li>• Emissions from vehicles and cargo ships</li> <li>• Effects of emissions on surface waters</li> <li>• Legislation</li> <li>• Dust</li> <li>• Odour</li> <li>• Mercury tailings disturbance (volatization)</li> </ul>	5.1.2.2/5.1.6.1, 7.2.1 4.1.6/7.2.1/5.3.6.3 5.1.6.1 2.2.4.3/6.1.6 2.2.3/8.2.1.6 5.1.6/5.1.22.1/7.2..1 7.2.1.2 5.1.22.1/ Table 5.1-8/ 7.2.5
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency, Duration, Limits</li> <li>• Guidelines</li> <li>• Cumulative effects</li> <li>• Monitoring</li> <li>• Receptors</li> </ul>	4.2.6/5.1.11.1/5.1.11.2/5.1.12.2/ 8.2.1.16/ 8.4.1.13 6.0 8.0 2.0, 7.0 5.1.16
Light	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects of sky-glow to human health</li> <li>• Flare stacks and aviation safety</li> <li>• Impacts to birds</li> <li>• Monitoring and mitigation</li> </ul>	8.2.1.15 8.2.1.15 6.1.14 7.2.2/7.2.2.1/8.2.1.15, Table 8.2-10
Chemicals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inventory of imported, stored and produced chemicals</li> <li>• Containment concerns</li> <li>• Dangerous goods</li> <li>• Federal identifications and recognitions</li> </ul>	2.0 2.0/5.0/6.0 Table 1.3-1/2.2-2 1.0/2.0
Solid Waste Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characterization</li> <li>• Potential impacts</li> </ul>	2.2.5.1/2.2.6.6 5.1.22
Surface Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mercury characterization and monitoring in sediments and waters</li> <li>• Mitigation and protection</li> <li>• Fisheries resources</li> <li>• Acid leaching from rocks</li> <li>• Blasting impacts</li> <li>• Flow peaks</li> </ul>	5.1.5.1 / 5.1.22.1 / 5.2.5.1  5.1.1.2 / 5.1.2.2 5.1.23 / 5.2.10.1 / 5.2.23 5.1.2.2 / 5.1.3.1 / 5.1.5.1 / 5.1.5.2 5.1.3.1 / 5.1.3.2 / 5.1.3.4 5.1.12 / 5.1.1.3 / 5.1.2.3

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Groundwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mitigation and protection</li> <li>• Awareness of nearby resident well-owners</li> <li>• Contingency plans</li> <li>• Guidelines</li> <li>• Lab analysis</li> <li>• Temporary on-site water use approval</li> </ul>	5.1.3.2 5.1.3.4 / 5.1.3.2 5.1.3.4 5.1.3.2 5.1.3.2 / 5.1.3.4 5.1.3.4
Geology, Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil and marine sediments survey</li> <li>• Soil and sediments pollution</li> <li>• Underlying rock groups</li> </ul>	5.1.5.2 / 5.1.10.1 / 5.2.10.1 5.1.5 / 5.2.5 / 5.3.5 5.1.10.1 / 5.2.10.1
Watercourses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing uses</li> <li>• Crossings and alterations permits</li> <li>• Mapping</li> <li>• Protection</li> </ul>	4.2.2.2 / 4.2.3.3 / 4.3.8.1 / 4.3.8.2 5.1.10.4 / 5.2.10.4 4.1.2 / 4.1.1.1 / 4.2.2.1 5.1.2.2
Freshwater Aquatic Species and Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mercury characterization and monitoring in waters and sediments</li> <li>• Risk assessment of mercury exposure to fish</li> <li>• Maps of nearby mercury exceedances</li> <li>• Pond habitat loss</li> <li>• Maintenance stream flows</li> <li>• Wetland habitat loss</li> <li>• Wetland protection and mitigation measures</li> </ul>	5.1.5.1 / 5.1.22.1 / 5.2.5.1 4.1.2 / 4.1.4 / 4.1.5.2 / 4.2.2.1 Not available 5.1.10.1 / 5.2.10.1 5.1.1.1 / 5.1.1.4 / 5.1.2.2 / 5.1.2.4 / 5.1.3.1 / 5.1.14.2 5.1.14.1 / 5.2.14.1 5.1.14.2 / 5.2.14.2
Effluent Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characterization and monitoring</li> <li>• Treatment</li> <li>• Disposal location</li> <li>• Impacts to fish</li> <li>• Cooling water and hydrostatic test water releases</li> <li>• Protection of facilities access from birds</li> </ul>	5.1.2.1 / 5.1.14.2 5.1.2.2 5.1.2.2 Outside scope of CSR 5.1.2.2 Outside scope of CSR
Marine Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public right of navigation assessment</li> <li>• NWPA</li> <li>• TERMPOL</li> <li>• Meteorological and climatological impacts on navigation</li> <li>• Wave propagation and shoreline impacts</li> <li>• Seabed characteristics</li> <li>• Fuel tanks</li> <li>• Permit for infilling during wharf construction</li> <li>• Disposal at sea permits if dredging becomes necessary</li> </ul>	TERMPOL 2.0 5.1.9.2 / 5.2.20.2 / 5.2.21 / 5.3.9.1 / 5.3.21 5.3.9.1 4.2.2.1 4.2.2.1 5.1.3.4 5.2.14.2 will be addressed through permitting if required



Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Marine Species and Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation plan for wharf infill and construction impacts</li> <li>• Habitat loss</li> <li>• Effects of wharf construction on siltation, erosion, aquaculture and migration</li> <li>• Time of year construction will occur</li> <li>• Benthic studies</li> <li>• Shoreline stabilization</li> <li>• Impacts of disturbing contaminated marine sediment</li> <li>• Biota analyses</li> </ul>	<p>5.2.14.2 / 5.2.10.1/Appendix 5</p> <p>5.1.10 / 5.1.23.1 / 5.2.10</p> <p>5.2.10.1 / 5.2.24</p> <p>2.2.5</p> <p>4.2.2.1</p> <p>5.1.10.4 / 5.2.10.4 / 5.2.19.2</p> <p>5.2.8.2 / 5.2.5 / 5.2.8</p> <p>5.1.10 / 5.1.11 / 5.2.10 / 5.2.11 5.3.10 / 5.3.11</p>
Birds and Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collection methods of wildlife and bird surveys</li> <li>• Mitigation and protection</li> <li>• Previous survey reports</li> <li>• Abundance and fecundity</li> <li>• Distance of known colonies from Project Area</li> <li>• Breeding season disturbances</li> <li>• Sensitive bird habitat disturbances</li> <li>• Migratory birds</li> <li>• Habitat restoration and relocation</li> <li>• SARA</li> <li>• Cumulative Effects with nearby Project Areas</li> <li>• Species mentioned include deer, Rusty Blackbird, Northern Commandra, Blue Heron, Roseate Terns, Greater Yellowlegs, Common Loon, Short-eared Owl, and Wood Turtle.</li> </ul>	<p>4.2.3.3 / 4.2.3.4</p> <p>5.1.9.2 / 5.1.13.2 / 5.2.9.2 / 5.2.13.2 / 5.3.9.2 / 5.3.13.2</p> <p>4.2.3.3 / 4.2.3.4</p> <p>4.2.3.3</p> <p>5.3.9.1</p> <p>5.2.16 / 5.1.12.1 / 5.1.13.1</p> <p>5.3.9.1 / 5.1.9.1</p> <p>5.1.9 / 5.1.13 / 5.2.9 / 5.2.13 / 5.3.9 / 5.3.13</p> <p>5.1.9.4 / 5.1.10.2 / 5.2.8.4 / 5.2.10.2</p> <p>4.2.5 / 5.1.9</p> <p>8.0</p> <p>4.2.3 / 4.2.5 / 5.1.12 / 5.1.13 / 5.2.9 / 5.2.12</p> <p>5.2.13 / 5.3.9 / 5.3.13</p>
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rare species</li> <li>• Surveys and monitoring</li> <li>• Effects of air emissions on boreal felt lichen</li> <li>• Species at risk area</li> <li>• Field expertise</li> <li>• Area loss</li> <li>• Invasive species avoidance during reclamation</li> </ul>	<p>4.1 / 4.2.4 / Table 4.2-13, 4.2.5.3</p> <p>4.2.5 / 7.2.6.2</p> <p>5.1.9.1 / 6.1.8 / Table 6.1-8</p> <p>4.2.5 / 6.1.8 / 8.2.1.8 / 8.3.1.9</p> <p>1/4.1</p> <p>5.1.8</p> <p>5.1.14.1 / 5.1.14.2</p>

Category	Topics Raised	Addressed in CSR Section
Accidents & Malfunctions: Spill Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spill control plan, including equipment and employee training</li> <li>• Well monitoring</li> <li>• Protection of birds</li> <li>• Environmental Contingency Plan</li> <li>• Clean-up and disposal procedures</li> <li>• LNG release modelling</li> </ul>	10.1.1.3/ 10.1.1.4  6.0/ Table 6.1-3 7.0 10.1.1.5 10.1.1.5 10.1.1.2
Accidents & Malfunctions: Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deluge system</li> <li>• Extreme weather and climate change</li> <li>• Containment</li> <li>• Seismic activity</li> <li>• Power failure</li> <li>• Port and Marine Safety</li> </ul>	5.0/ 10.0 9.0/ 9.2.7 10.1.1.1 9.0/ 9.2.2
Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses in public meetings</li> <li>• Table of Public Consultation</li> <li>• Fishermen: Awareness of impacts and compensation</li> </ul>	Table 2.5-1/ 6.0/ 6.2.16/ 6.3.10 3.1/ 3.3.2/ 3.5 Tables 3.2-1/ 3.2-2/ Appendix 4 3.3.2/ 5.0/ 5.2.23.1
First Nation Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Method of consultation</li> <li>• Impacts on aboriginal land use</li> <li>• Mitigations concerning artifact discovery</li> </ul>	3.4 3.4.2 6.0/ Tables 6.1.6/ 6.1-18/ 6.2-14
Report Editorials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific text re-writes</li> <li>• Rename Section Heading</li> <li>• Areas with Redundancy</li> <li>• Errors in Tables</li> <li>• Info irrelevant to Federal Scope or CEAA</li> <li>• Requested Text Deletions</li> <li>• Info in wrong section of report or wrong context</li> <li>• Typos</li> <li>• Incorrect References present</li> </ul>	Throughout CSR Report