



Government
of Canada

Gouvernement
du Canada

2017-2018 Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under Section 71 of
the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*

Canada The wordmark for Canada, with a small red maple leaf icon integrated into the letter 'a'.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, 2018.

This publication may be reproduced for personal or internal use without permission, provided the source is fully acknowledged. However, multiple copy reproduction of this publication in whole or in part for purposes of redistribution requires the prior written permission from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3, or info@ceaa-acee.gc.ca

Catalogue No.: En104-13E-PDF

ISSN: 2292-2385

This document is issued in French under the title: Rapport des autorités fédérales ayant des obligations au titre de *l'article 71 de la Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale* (2012) pour l'année 2017-2018

Alternative formats may be requested by contacting: info@ceaa-acee.gc.ca

Foreword to the 2017-2018 Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*

I am pleased to table the attached report entitled “Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*” (CEAA 2012). This consolidated report is being tabled on behalf of federal authorities to ensure that Parliament receives information on activities on federal lands and outside Canada in a timely, efficient and transparent manner. Federal authorities must table an annual report in Parliament in order to meet their section 71 obligation under CEAA 2012. The federal authorities that have included their reports in this consolidated report satisfy this obligation. Other federal authorities who have an existing mechanism for reporting to Parliament, typically an annual report, should have satisfied this obligation through that mechanism. This is the sixth consolidated report tabled in Parliament since the implementation of CEAA 2012.

CEAA 2012 is focused on environmental assessments of designated projects. CEAA 2012 also includes provisions to ensure that projects on federal lands and outside Canada are considered in a careful and precautionary manner. Sections 66-72 of CEAA 2012 require authorities to determine the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects that might result from a project being carried out on federal lands or outside Canada. Authorities must make this determination prior to making a decision in relation to a project that would enable the project to proceed in whole or in part. If an authority concludes that a project is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, the authority may refer the project to the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council will determine whether the significant adverse environmental effects are justified in the circumstances.

CEAA 2012 does not specify how authorities are to conduct their analysis for determining significant adverse environmental effects. An evaluation tool was developed by authorities, with support from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, setting out a framework for a consistent approach and facilitating the joint analysis of projects involving multiple authorities. However, authorities define the process by which they conduct their analysis, and the breadth of their selected governance activities are reflected in the enclosed reports.

Section 71 reports have been provided by federal authorities to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency for consolidation. A number of federal authorities have highlighted a project to demonstrate how the policies and approaches they use to assess the potential impacts of proposed projects are being implemented to ensure that there are no significant adverse environmental effects. If you have questions with respect to the information provided in these reports, please contact the appropriate federal authority.

Table of Contents

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.....	1
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.....	2
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.....	3
Belledune Port Authority.....	4
Business Development Bank of Canada.....	5
Canada Border Services Agency.....	6
Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions.....	7
Canadian Food Inspection Agency.....	8
Canadian Heritage.....	9
Canadian Institutes of Health Research.....	10
Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency.....	11
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.....	12
Canadian Space Agency.....	13
Canadian Tourism Commission.....	14
Copyright Board of Canada.....	15
Correctional Service Canada.....	16
Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada / Indigenous Services Canada.....	17
Department of National Defence.....	18
Employment and Social Development Canada.....	19
Environment and Climate Change Canada.....	20
Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario.....	21
Fisheries and Oceans Canada.....	22
Global Affairs Canada.....	23
Halifax Port Authority.....	24
Hamilton Port Authority.....	25
Health Canada.....	26
Infrastructure Canada.....	27
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.....	28
Montreal Port Authority.....	29
Nanaimo Port Authority.....	30
National Research Council.....	31

Natural Resources Canada	32
Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada	33
Oshawa Port Authority	34
Parks Canada Agency	35
Port Alberni Port Authority	36
Prince Rupert Port Authority	37
Public Health Agency of Canada	38
Public Services and Procurement Canada.....	39
Québec Port Authority	40
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	41
Saguenay Port Authority	42
Sept-Îles Port Authority	43
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.....	44
St. John's Port Authority	45
Standards Council of Canada	46
Statistics Canada	47
Thunder Bay Port Authority.....	48
Transport Canada.....	49
Trois-Rivières Port Authority.....	50
Vancouver Fraser Port Authority	51
Western Economic Diversification Canada	52
Windsor Port Authority.....	53

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

To facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) implements a risk-based approach to the environmental evaluation of departmental activities. The approach is based on guidance provided by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. It ensures consistency in the application of CEAA 2012 to departmental activities, and that environmental risks are assessed in advance of any project taking place on federal lands. AAFC categorizes projects into those having low, moderate or high environmental risk. Based on risk criteria, Departmental officials make the determination on the potential for significant adverse environmental effects for individual projects, and incorporate mitigation measures, as appropriate, to minimize environmental impacts.

Between April 1, 2017 and March 31, 2018, AAFC determined that no project was likely to have significant adverse environmental effects and did not refer any projects to the Governor in Council.

An example of an AAFC project that required an environmental effects evaluation in 2017-2018 is the replacement of a small bridge over a creek on AAFC land in Saskatchewan. The project entailed removing an old timber bridge, shrubs and aquatic vegetation on the upstream and downstream sides of the structure, excavating, grading, and finally the installation of a concrete box culvert structure. The design of the new structure allows for flows into the creek to be maintained and accommodates fish passage. The existing roadway continues to meet traffic needs, and surface drainage patterns have been maintained across the project extent. Potential environmental risks included erosion and sedimentation, impacts on water quality and aquatic habitat, and disturbance to vegetation, wildlife and/or wildlife habitat. Mitigation measures were designed to address these specific risks.

Project work was completed after receiving federal and provincial permits. Construction was carried out in a way that minimized the disturbance of the adjacent creek and upland habitat areas, and appropriate sediment and erosion control measures were implemented. Project construction took place when the creek bed was dry, and outside the restricted activity timing windows for spring spawning fish in southern Saskatchewan. With the incorporation of mitigation measures, the project was completed with no significant adverse environmental effects.

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) has implemented a thorough approach to evaluating environmental impacts under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

ACOA assesses each project to ensure compliance with CEAA 2012. An analysis of all potential environmental effects of a project on federal lands is completed and a determination is made before a project is approved for funding.

ACOA has a contract with Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) to conduct environmental effects analyses under section 67 of CEAA 2012. PSPC provides ACOA with the expertise and guidance that allows it to make an informed determination.

To date, all projects on federal lands that have received a contribution from ACOA were determined not likely to have a significant adverse environmental effects.

Further information on ACOA's projects can be found at www.acoa-apeca.gc.ca.

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) serves Canada as a responsible steward of the environment. AECL is committed to assess the impacts of all of our activities on the environment through rigorous internal processes. Canadian Nuclear Laboratories Ltd. (CNL) operates facilities on behalf of AECL. Many of these facilities are licensed by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC), and as such, the CNSC's regulatory requirements must be met.

CNL has implemented a risk based approach to address the requirements of sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). Environmental Reviews for low risk projects where conventional mitigation measures can be applied, undergo a streamlined review. Reviews for moderate risk projects where there is greater potential for impacts on environment or humans undergo a more rigorous review. Criteria used to distinguish moderate risk projects include the size of the building footprint, potential for airborne or liquid effluents, potential for effects on species at risk and potential for Indigenous communities and public concern.

An example of a project reviewed in 2017-18 involved the proposed construction of a logistics building on AECL's Chalk River Laboratory (CRL) site, located 200km west of Ottawa in the province of Ontario. The primary purpose of the building will be to act as a shipping, receiving and storage terminal located at the outer entrance to the CRL site.

During the section 67 review, tree clearing was a proposed activity for site preparation. Due to the location of the treed area, an evaluation was conducted to determine the suitability of the proposed area for bat habitat. This involved the identification of tree species, their size and decay class in addition to acoustic monitoring at random habitat plots to identify which bats were present. Based on the studies, it was confirmed that the proposed area of development was not within suitable habitat for this type of Species at Risk (SAR) and therefore confirmed there would be no negative impacts to SAR due to project activities.

In the fiscal year 2017-2018, no projects were determined to have likely significantly adverse environmental effects. Additional information on environmental performance at AECL sites (operated by Canadian Nuclear Laboratories) is provided on the website www.cnl.ca.

Belledune Port Authority

The Belledune Port Authority is committed to ensuring that the Port and its clients do not negatively impact the environment. The Port has developed environmental management systems based on sound principles and measures.

The Port and its tenants adhere to the requirements of numerous acts and regulations including the *Canada Marine Act*, the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Canadian Shipping Act, 2001*, and the *Fisheries Act*, among others.

Projects undertaken by the Port, its clients or its tenants within the jurisdictional area of the Belledune Port Authority undergo environmental reviews by experts to determine potential adverse environmental effects to air, land, and water and to identify methods of mitigation if necessary. These assessments, in addition to review and continual improvement of policies and legislation, ensure the Belledune Port Authority meets its environmental responsibilities.

During the 2017 fiscal year, the Port of Belledune initiated or completed the following project:

- Relocation of the storage of bulk zinc products from Terminal 1 to Terminal 3.

Additional information is available at the Port of Belledune's website:

<http://www.portofbelledune.ca/index.php>.

Business Development Bank of Canada

Given its mandate to support entrepreneurs, and recognizing that most businesses entail some degree of environmental risk, the Business Development Bank of Canada (BDC) has a rigorous governance structure in place.

BDC's governance structure comprises of a Board-approved Policy on the Environment. Emanating from this policy are detailed procedures, business rules, processes, and tools that ensure that these principles and objectives are achieved. BDC's Policy, business rules, processes and procedures are subject to regular review to ensure consistency with evolving legislation and best practices. Compliance is monitored as part of BDC's Quality Review and Internal Audit processes.

Funding of certain projects designated by the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* and listed in BDC Procedures can only be approved upon receipt of an assessment confirming that the project is unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. Internal assessments and site visits are also conducted to identify and classify possible environmental liabilities and environmental effects associated with a property's past and present use. BDC makes use of third-party environmental consultants in cases where an internal assessment is deemed insufficient, inconclusive or where serious concerns are identified.

Projects undertaken on federal lands and in jurisdictions outside Canada are subject to the same principles and activities outlined above. To the best of its knowledge, BDC attests that it has not, including the past fiscal year ended March 31, 2018, financed any projects that could have significant adverse environmental effects.

Canada Border Services Agency

The Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) is committed to the protection of the environment and as such conducts its operations and activities in an environmentally responsible and sustainable manner. Under section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, the CBSA is required to conduct a determination of the significance of adverse environmental effects of its projects. CBSA maintains an internal environmental assessment process to meet this requirement.

The process, which has been integrated with the CBSA Real Property Investment Board, is a risk-based approach that considers scope and complexity of proposed projects to ensure that careful assessments are conducted and any potential environmental effects considered.

The approach consists of an Environmental Effects Checklist, a screening tool that evaluates proposed projects to ensure their environmental effects are assessed. If the screening checklist identifies sensitive environmental receptors, or the scope of the project is of a magnitude such that there is a greater potential for environmental effects, a more detailed evaluation is required.

For all projects that had the potential for adverse environmental effects, mitigation measures were implemented to reduce or eliminate the risk to the environment. All assessments and mitigation measures are reviewed by the CBSA Environmental Operations Division and the CBSA maintains an inventory of all assessments, including records of decision.

Project Highlight: Construction of the Immigration Monitoring Centre in Laval, Quebec

The project involved the construction planning of the Immigration Monitoring Centre, located in Laval, Quebec on federal lands. The surrounding environment includes a grassy plateau to the north, including a creek. The remaining surrounding area comprises of pre-existing buildings. The work will involve demolishing the existing buildings, excavation and soil management, construction of new infrastructure, and backfilling and landscaping.

Environmental impacts such as terrestrial habitat disturbance, accidental site contamination, and temporary poor air quality had the greatest likelihood to result in adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures including constructing a habitat fence to reduce the flow of species into the construction site, installing sediment barriers to protect Pinière Creek, and conducting activities in a way to keep dust and particulates down, were incorporated into the project design to reduce the risk.

Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions

Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions (CED) assesses all projects to determine environmental impacts in order to ensure compliance with sections 67 to 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) before approving a financial contribution. Generally, projects funded by CED are unlikely to have an environmental impact.

During fiscal year 2017-2018, 17 active projects were assessed, 16 of which had no adverse environmental effects requiring mitigation measures and one with mitigation measures identified to be put in place to reduce the environmental impact.

Governance Activities

CED ensures that the governance mechanism put in place to comply with CEAA 2012, including projects on federal lands, is consistent with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's approach and interpretations. The approach is to review each project for compliance with CEAA 2012. CED has produced guidelines within a program management manual to ensure a consistent and comprehensive approach to environmental assessment under sections 67 to 69 of CEAA 2012.

CED has established a contract with Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) for the assessment of environmental impacts and mitigation measures for all projects subject to CEAA 2012, including those carried out on federal lands where potential adverse environmental effects have been previously identified by CED. The evaluations conducted by PSPC enable CED to ensure that projects comply with CEAA 2012.

Canadian Food Inspection Agency

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) has developed and is utilizing a comprehensive guideline on Environmental Effects Evaluations (EEE) to facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. The guideline provides the detailed process for decision makers to effectively include considerations of environmental risk and appropriate mitigation measures into real property projects.

By adopting a risk-based approach, a determination is made whether projects have low, moderate or high environmental risk. CFIA decision-makers are able to implement appropriate mitigation measures for projects of varying risks. Once the risk level is defined, the guideline specifies the next steps for projects that require an EEE to determine the potential for significant adverse effects.

In 2017-2018, the CFIA oversaw one EEE for a project that was deemed “medium” risk. The project that was reviewed was a storage tank installation project at the CFIA’s Laboratory in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. The project consisted of the construction of a new aboveground fuel storage tank and associated fuel distribution system, product transfer area, filling system, and monitoring system. The project also included the removal of the existing underground storage tank.

An EEE was conducted based on the potential effects of the project on the water quality, soil and groundwater quality, air quality, and biological environment of the site. The EEE concluded that the undertaking of the project would not result in significant adverse environmental effects, and mitigation measures were implemented to minimize potential effects. Such mitigation measures included, but are not limited to: implementing proper erosion and sediment control measures; properly stabilizing excavated soils and taking measures to avoid putting sediment laden runoff into the stormwater system; removing excavated soil should it be impacted by hydrocarbons; putting spill response plans in place; and, mitigating effects on air quality by minimizing idling of gas powered equipment and vehicles.

In 2017-2018, no assessed projects were determined to be likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. No referral to Governor in Council was required.

Canadian Heritage

In response to its obligations outlined in the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), Canadian Heritage (PCH) has developed and implemented a risk-based approach to evaluate the environmental effects of its activities and funded projects. The approach is based on guidance provided by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and ensures consistency in the application of CEAA 2012 for all projects on federal lands.

Departmental officials make the determination on the potential for significant adverse environmental effects of proposed projects that fall under the definition of a project under CEAA 2012 and incorporate mitigation measures as appropriate to minimize environmental impacts. In most cases, these are considered to be small projects and are unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. Such projects could include the erection of a monument, the construction, renovation or expansion of sporting facilities, schools or cultural buildings. Determinations made in 2017–2018 with regard to environmental effects indicated that no PCH projects were likely to have significant adverse environmental effects and, as such, the Department did not refer any projects to the Governor in Council.

For example, in 2017, Art in the Tunnels Public Art Exhibit was a project for which it was determined that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, it was not likely to cause adverse environmental effects.

The project involved the installation of a flexible mounting system for large-format artworks in the two recreational pathway tunnels under the Portage Bridge. This entailed the drilling of small holes along the tunnel walls to allow artworks to be displayed in various configurations. The project was completed in an urban environment, beneath street level. The tunnels are reinforced concrete and the ground is paved in asphalt. The west and east tunnels are approximately 100 metres and 75 metres from the Ottawa River (respectively).

Potential release of hazardous substances and designated substances, noise production, disturbance of migratory birds and wildlife as well as closure of recreational pathways had the greatest likelihood to result in adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures had been identified and were incorporated in the project and implemented during construction. These included measures on what to do if a nest was found and closing only half of the pathway at a time with proper barriers being put in place.

Canadian Institutes of Health Research

The Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) has determined there is minimal risk that the organization will carry out or financially support projects that fall under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). Given that CIHR is a federal health research funding agency and does not conduct its own research, projects falling under CEAA 2012 would be research proposals submitted to CIHR for funding. CIHR has made compliance with CEAA 2012 a requirement for obtaining agency funding. As such, it has implemented a mandatory field within its research funding application forms whereby research proposals that potentially fall under the Act are identified and flagged in CIHR's database at the application intake stage. Should the research proposal be successful, CIHR then follows up with the applicant to obtain the information necessary to make a determination following the guidelines and criteria set out in *Projects on Federal Lands: Making a determination under section 67 of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. Database controls are in place to ensure that no federal funds are released until CIHR is fully satisfied that the project is unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects on federal lands or outside Canada. This process is actively monitored for continuous improvement.

In fiscal year 2017-2018, CIHR did not support projects that fell under sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012.

Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency

The Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (CanNor) reports to Parliament through the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development and supports the development and diversification of the northern economy in the territories. CanNor's Northern Projects Management Office provides support to industry and Indigenous organizations to advance resource management projects at all stages of resource development; however, the Agency does not fund nor provide authority to projects on federal lands within or outside of Canada. The *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) does not generally apply in the territories and since CanNor does not fund or authorize projects under sections 67 to 69 of *CEAA 2012*, the Agency does not have any activities to report.

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) is mandated under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act* (NSCA) to regulate all nuclear facilities and nuclear-related activities in Canada. Before any person or company can prepare a site, construct, operate, decommission or abandon a nuclear facility – or possess, use, transport or store nuclear substances – they must obtain a licence from the CNSC.

Protecting the environment is part of the CNSC's mandate. The CNSC requires the environmental effects of all facilities or activities to be evaluated and considered when licensing decisions are made. Before a licence can be granted, the Commission (or a designated officer) must be satisfied, pursuant to subsection 24(4) of the NSCA, that the applicant or licensee will make adequate provision for the protection of the environment and the health and safety of persons.

For projects proposed to be carried out on federal lands, as defined in section 66 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), and requiring a decision by the CNSC as the federal authority, the Commission must also determine, in accordance with section 67 of CEAA 2012, whether the completion of a proposed project is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, taking into consideration the implementation of mitigation measures.

In fiscal year 2017-2018, the Commission did not receive any application for projects subject to section 67 of CEAA 2012.

Canadian Space Agency

Pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), the Canadian Space Agency (CSA) has implemented a rigorous approach for reviewing all its projects and considering their potential for significant adverse environmental effects prior to undertaking them. This approach is entrenched within the CSA's *Investment Governance and Monitoring Framework* (IGMF), which establishes the governance structures, accountability, standard practices and processes directing the planning and oversight of CSA's investments throughout their lifecycle.

The IGMF sets out a multi-phased approach to investment decision-making and associated gating. Once selected for further development, proposed projects enter their initial planning phase, which requires a preliminary assessment of project activities, founded on *Public Services and Procurement Canada* (PSPC) *Environmental Compliance Management Program* checklist. Projects involving listed activities are then referred to PSPC for complete review and analysis. As necessary, PSPC provides CEAA 2012 advice and services to the CSA, including the performance of environmental assessments. Based on the assessed level of risk, appropriate risk mitigation strategies are defined, implemented, monitored, and controlled throughout the project and investment lifecycle.

The CSA's organizational project management capacity and the IGMF are subject to regular mandatory assessments and audits, which form the basis of a three-year continuous improvement plan.

For fiscal year 2017-18, no CSA projects were deemed to pose adverse environmental effects, and, no projects were referred to the Governor in Council.

Canadian Tourism Commission

Destination Canada, the operating name for the Canadian Tourism Commission, is Canada's national tourism marketing organization. Destination Canada works in partnership with the tourism industries in eleven countries around the world to promote Canada as a premier travel and meetings destination.

To facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), Destination Canada uses an established process to determine the adverse environmental effects resulting from any projects it undertakes on federal lands or outside Canada.

In accordance with section 71 of CEAA 2012, Destination Canada has determined that, for the 2017-2018 fiscal year, it did not undertake any projects on federal lands or outside Canada that were likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Copyright Board of Canada

The Copyright Board of Canada (the Board) is a quasi-judicial tribunal that establishes royalties to be paid for the use of copyrighted works. As part of its mandate, the Board does not initiate or participate in any physical activity that is carried out on federal lands or outside Canada in relation to a physical work.

Consequently, for fiscal year 2017-18, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

Correctional Service Canada

Correctional Service Canada (CSC) uses a risk-based approach to comply with its legislative requirements under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. CSC's approach involves screening proposed projects using an internal checklist to separate projects that require further investigation from routine low-risk projects whose environmental effects are known and can be easily controlled with standard mitigation measures. Projects that require further investigation undergo an Environmental Effects Evaluation which systematically evaluates and documents the anticipated environmental effects of a proposed project and determines the need to modify the project plan or recommend further mitigation to eliminate or minimize the adverse environmental effects.

In fiscal year 2017-2018, CSC did not have any projects that were found to have significant adverse environmental effects nor were any projects referred to the Governor in Council for a determination on the justification of effects.

More information about CSC's approach to assessing potential environmental impacts of projects is outlined in an internal policy document entitled Internal Service Directive 318-11 – *Environmental Assessment of Projects* which can be found at <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/318-11-isd-eng.shtml>.

Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada / Indigenous Services Canada

Pursuant to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs and Indigenous Services Canada review projects and consider their environmental effects including effects on Indigenous peoples, prior to issuance of a permit, lease, licence or other authorizations.

For projects south of 60° on-reserve, the departments Environmental Review Process consists of a suite of policy tools informed by the perspectives of various stakeholders, including First Nations and industry representatives. In the few cases where CEAA 2012 applies in the North (areas within Nunavut, but excluded from the Nunavut Settlement Area, and the Inuvialuit Settlement Region of the Northwest Territories), Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs and Indigenous Services Canada review each project on a case-by-case basis to determine if there are any adverse environmental impacts or impacts to Indigenous peoples as per section 5 (1)(c) of CEAA 2012.

The Environmental Review Process ensures that projects receive a risk assessment and scrutiny commensurate to the level of risk and the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects associated with carrying out the project. For the fiscal year 2017-2018, the departments determined that none of the projects they reviewed were likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. No referral to Governor in Council was required.

For further information on the process, please visit the website: www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1345141628060/1345141658639.

Department of National Defence

Under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), the Department of National Defence (DND) is required to conduct a determination of the significance of adverse environmental effects associated with planned projects on federal lands and outside of Canada. For fiscal year 2017-2018, all DND projects requiring a determination of significance were evaluated to confirm that adverse environmental effects were unlikely. There was no referral to Governor in Council.

DND's policy instruments and guidance facilitates compliance with sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012 and promotes thorough analysis of all potential significant adverse environmental effects and developing effective mitigation measure to address them. For lower risk activities, an Abbreviated Reporting Criteria has been established to streamline compliance of frequently recurring projects.

Project Example:

A review of the potential significant adverse environmental effects was conducted for the installation of a prefabricated steel clear-span bridge at the DND property at Garrison Wainwright in Wainwright, Alberta. The project consisted of removing the existing bridge, replacement of existing concrete abutments, upgrading the existing approaches to the bridge and finally installation of the clear-span bridge that will cross the Battle River. The project site along the Battle River consists of some shrubs such as willow, riparian grasses and sedges.

Potential significant adverse environmental effects of the project were assessed and mitigation measures have been identified to minimize or eliminate these effects on aquatic habitat and water quality, and vegetation. On the basis of the Environmental Effects Determination, it was been determined that the project was not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Employment and Social Development Canada

Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) funding does not typically support large scale economic capital ventures that are likely to create environmental impacts. Examples of projects that ESDC typically support include:

- employment recruitment, training and placement for targeted client groups;
- small scale renovations (i.e. building wheelchair accessible ramps for a First Nation band office);
- full building renovations (homelessness projects); and,
- smaller scale new building construction – typically one or two story buildings for homeless shelters.

In order to facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, ESDC ensures that:

- projects are tracked through ESDC's Common System for Grants and Contributions (CSGC); and
- when a project has been identified, it is assessed to determine whether it will likely cause significant adverse environmental effects. This assessment is conducted through a series of questions and guidance provided in the CSGC as well as the Department's Operational Guide. The assessment must be completed before a funding decision is made.

The projects that were assessed this past fiscal year did not cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Environment and Climate Change Canada

This is Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) sixth report tabled in Parliament for activities on federal lands and outside of Canada in accordance with section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*.

During fiscal year 2017-2018, ECCC reviewed 34 projects. ECCC concluded that these projects either would not likely result in significant adverse environmental effects or with the application of appropriate environmental mitigation measures would likely not cause significant adverse environmental effects.

The construction and installation of two observation decks at the Shepody National Wildlife Area, in Albert County, New Brunswick, is an example of a project assessed by ECCC. This project entailed the construction of two observation decks to replace deteriorating assets and will also provide safer access for members of the general public, as well as for maintenance staff and emergency responders should they require access to the hiking trail. This project required the implementation of mitigation measures to address potential adverse environmental effects.

In order to address potential damage or disturbance to migratory birds, construction activities were limited to the period between November and December 2017. Measures such as including silt fences and hay bales were employed to prevent the release of silt into the wetland area. All exposed soil was stabilized during project activities and after work ceased. All disturbed surfaces were seeded with triple mix and covered with hay mulch. There was no temporary or permanent storage of machinery, equipment, spoils, fill or any other material associated with the project in the wetland. No machinery was re-fuelled within the National Wildlife Area. Spill response supplies were on site to deal with any potential accidental petroleum release. Taking into account the implementation of these mitigation measures, ECCC concluded that this project was not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario

The Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario (FedDev Ontario) assesses all projects on federal lands for environmental effects to ensure compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) before approving a funding contribution. Direct recipients of FedDev Ontario funding that have third-party funding agreements are required to submit any projects on federal lands to FedDev Ontario for determination under CEAA 2012 before finalizing a funding contribution with the third party.

FedDev Ontario established a contract with Public Services and Procurement Canada to conduct environmental effects evaluations under section 67 of CEAA 2012 for all projects on federal lands involving a physical activity in relation to a physical work. These assessments inform FedDev Ontario's determinations under CEAA 2012. Where required, mitigation measures are included in contribution agreements with recipients.

For fiscal year 2017-18, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Fisheries and Oceans Canada has developed internal operational guidance that outlines an overarching risk-based approach for the assessment and reporting of environmental effects of projects proposed on federal lands that are subject to section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

For the past year, staff have reviewed and completed Project Effects Determination Reports for projects subject to section 67. The reports are a means to record the predicted environmental effects and the proposed mitigation measures that are applied to minimize the potential negative environmental effects of medium- to high-risk projects on federal lands.

The Department's Fisheries Protection Program owns and manages a national database that is used for collecting information on various program activities. This system, called the Program Activity Tracking for Habitat (PATH), has been made available to all programs in the Department who have responsibilities under CEAA 2012. PATH can be used to obtain statistical reports for projects that the department has evaluated under section 67 of CEAA 2012.

In the last year, there have been no determinations made where a project on federal lands was likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Global Affairs Canada

Global Affairs Canada (GAC) supports a broad range of international projects including, but not limited to, international development assistance program funding, the Peace and Stabilization Operations Program, the Canada Fund for Local Initiatives and the International Science & Technology Partnerships Program. GAC's environmental review processes contribute to the success of Departmental priorities such as strengthening the rules-based international order, advancing Canada's feminist foreign policy, pursuing a progressive trade agenda and maintaining constructive relations with the United States.

GAC demonstrates due diligence in decision-making under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* and support the Department's mandate, including Canada's reputation abroad for projects it funds or undertakes. Environmental reviews required for projects outside Canada respect foreign sovereignty, international law, and international agreements to which Canada is party.

The processes articulate roles and responsibilities to emphasize accountability within the Department for ensuring environmental reviews are conducted as appropriate, that decisions are documented, and that results are reported. Tailored processes have been implemented for specific GAC programs such as international development assistance. The level of effort and analysis undertaken corresponds with the level of anticipated environmental effects or risks of the proposed project. Environmental reviews conducted during the 2017-2018 fiscal year concluded that carrying out the projects were not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with mitigation measures implemented as proposed. Further information can be found on GAC's Sustainable Development website at <http://international.gc.ca/gac-amc/publications/sea-ees/sustainable-durable.aspx?lang=eng>.

Halifax Port Authority

The Halifax Port Authority is required by section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) to determine whether projects on federal lands are likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. This obligation applies when a Federal Authority proposes to carry out a project or before it exercises a power or performs a duty or function that could permit the project to proceed.

The Halifax Port Authority has developed a CEAA Environmental Form to provide potential proponents with a user friendly process which will meet the intent of CEAA 2012 for proposed projects on Halifax Port Authority Property. Federal department coordination and consultation with the subject matter experts at the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Transport Canada, and the Department of National Defense also factor within the determination process.

The Halifax Port Authority carried out a small number of environmental effects determinations within the specified time period. Projects reviewed within the timeframe were determined not to have significant adverse environmental effects.

Hamilton Port Authority

The Hamilton Port Authority (HPA) manages property comprised of federal lands and non-federal lands held in HPA's name along the shores of Hamilton Harbour in Lake Ontario. As a responsible steward of the lands in its care, HPA conducts environmental effects evaluations and determinations for both its own projects and those proposed by prospective tenants.

HPA conducts in-house environmental effects evaluations for routine construction projects that are not likely to result in significant environmental effects with the use of standard mitigation measures. Evaluations of projects involving an industrial or manufacturing process are conducted by qualified consultants, with the input of the appropriate authorities as required.

No projects were determined to have the potential for significant adverse environmental effects within the Hamilton Port Authority's fiscal year, ending December 2017.

Health Canada

Health Canada continues to ensure that it is meeting its obligations under section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, for activities related to real property on federal lands.

An internal procedure has been implemented that outlines the approach that project managers are to take in determining a project's likelihood to cause significant adverse environmental effects and in identifying proper mitigation measures. The procedure also identifies roles and responsibilities of the relevant parties.

Health Canada determined that there were no projects likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

The following example demonstrates how a risk-based approach is used for Health Canada projects on federal lands subject to section 67 determinations:

- Health Canada completed a multi-year project involving the deconstruction and demolition of a two-storey building located in an urban setting. The grounds have been transformed into a greenfield, available for public use.
- Environmental mitigation measures identified during the design phase were carried out over the course of the construction period. As a result, physical activities did not adversely impact the surrounding environment.

Infrastructure Canada

During the 2017/2018 fiscal year, there were no projects for which Infrastructure Canada was the lead federal authority as per section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). However, Infrastructure Canada continued to carry out their internal environmental determination process on infrastructure projects submitted for federal funding approval. This process was used to identify legislative CEAA 2012 requirements related to projects on federal lands and to ensure that these requirements were fulfilled to the satisfaction of the federal authority prior to flowing federal funds.

With respect to fulfilling section 67 requirements, the process continued to involve the following activities over the 2017/2018 fiscal year:

- Reviewing, analyzing and synthesizing information provided by funding applicants to verify whether CEAA 2012 applied to each prospective project.
- Determining, based on research conducted and on information provided, whether a project was proposed to be constructed, in whole or in part, on federal lands.
- Informing the appropriate federal authority if it was found that a project was proposed to be constructed, in whole or in part, on federal lands.
- If required, verifying that control mechanisms were in place, such as including requirements in the contribution agreement to ensure the completion of the Environmental Effects Evaluation (EEE) and that all conditions specified in the EEE were implemented.

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

To fulfill its obligations under sections 67 - 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, 2012, Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada determines the environmental impacts of projects on federal lands by using a process that provides an analysis of potential significant adverse environmental effects resulting from the projects funded, or implemented by, Innovation, Science and Economic Development.

The process enhances operational effectiveness and strengthens departmental accountability and governance with the implementation of procedural requirements to determine whether significant adverse environmental effects will be caused using a process described in guidelines.

The environmental impact of projects is assessed prior to making a decision on their implementation. Measures to mitigate the environmental impacts are included in the authority documents allowing the project to proceed. For fiscal year 2017-2018, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

Montreal Port Authority

The Montreal Port Authority (MPA)'s environmental management system ensures compliance with the requirements of sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. Procedures have been developed to ensure that issues, regulatory requirements and environmental aspects are taken into account as part of the management of contracts and leases signed with tenants, and where work is executed by tenants.

In addition, there is a similar procedure for all projects executed by MPA. These procedures ensure that environmental effects are assessed for any project or work executed on Port of Montreal's territory.

For example, in 2018, MPA completed a \$78-million project for the rehabilitation of Alexandra Pier and Iberville Passenger Terminal. The main objectives of this project were to rehabilitate these century old infrastructures and to improve the reception for cruise passengers arriving in Montréal. MPA relied on a concept for a better way to integrate the terminal and the pier, now called Grand Quay, into the urban fabric of Old Montreal. Furthermore, it meets the expectations of citizens who seek better access to their river, by clearing the end of the Grand Quay so that the far end has been lowered closer to the river, and by adding a green rooftop terrace. In addition, MPA has completed an innovative electrical shore power supply system project for cruise ships, thereby significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

An evaluation of environmental effects has been completed and it was determined that the environmental issues were, among others, the level of noise and visual integration aspects. To minimize impacts associated with the works taking place in the heart of Old Montreal, a very busy touristic area, trucks with a higher load capacity were favored to reduce the number of trucks circulating, a ship was docked near the building site to serve as a visual screen and a noise barrier, and the work schedule has been adapted. In addition, MPA has established channels of communication with the neighboring community to maintain harmonious relationships by listening to their needs and concerns.

For all the projects analyzed by MPA during the period, none were to cause significant adverse environmental effects. The review of these projects has shown that environmental effects could be managed through well-established and effective mitigation measures.

Nanaimo Port Authority

An environmental management approach is used for the review of projects on federal lands managed by the Nanaimo Port Authority, as defined under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 2012* (CEAA 2012). Environmental effects determination and assessments of planned projects are carried out by the Port Authority to determine if any significant adverse environmental effects are likely to occur and to meet the requirements of CEAA 2012.

Lower risk activities that are routine and predictable and incorporate effective and established mitigation measures and environmental best practices, may require less analysis, while higher risk activities will require greater scrutiny and review. This approach provides an appropriate level of review and risk assessment that is commensurate with the level of risk and likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects with carrying out the project.

During this reporting period, there were no projects determined as likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

National Research Council

The National Research Council of Canada's (NRC) organizational and reporting structure helps ensure compliance with sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. NRC's Health, Safety and Environment Branch is dedicated to working with project managers and researchers to ensure that construction and maintenance projects undertaken at NRC facilities across the country take into consideration environmental effects at the onset of project development and planning. It is through the internal Project Environmental Review process that alternatives and potential environmental effects are considered and mitigated.

As part of the Project Environmental Review process, NRC has adopted a risk-based approach to determine the level of involvement and review required; standard mitigation measures are applied to lower-risk projects. In collaboration with Environment and Climate Change Canada and others, NRC has developed protocols for review of projects and regulation/management of activities occurring in more sensitive areas (e.g. property providing habitat for species at risk, or projects of public or First Nations interest).

NRC continues to build and strengthen its structural and process controls by integrating the existing Project Environmental Review process into our newly launched Environmental Management System. This will allow for NRC to continue fostering a culture that includes environmental stewardship while fulfilling its mandate as Canada's premier research organization.

No NRC projects approved in 2017-18 were determined to have the potential for significant adverse environmental effects.

Natural Resources Canada

Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) classifies projects using a tri-level Environmental Effects Evaluation process to evaluate the potential environmental effects of projects that it enables to be carried out on federal lands and outside of Canada. NRCan collaborates with other departments on joint projects and projects requiring broader federal review, including National Defence, the National Capital Commission, Public Service and Procurement Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada to make determinations under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*. Project proposals reviewed in 2017-2018 spanned across a range of subject areas, such as the construction and operation of a carbon dioxide capture plant, maintenance of seismic stations, and the reconditioning of sawmill equipment.

No projects were determined as likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada

The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) requires applicants to self-identify on applications for funding when any proposed activities are being undertaken outdoors, and the activities take place on federal lands or outside of Canada. These applications are reviewed to determine whether they constitute a project as defined under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), and any projects are in turn assessed in terms of their likelihood of having significant adverse environmental effects as described in CEAA 2012. Applicants who are requesting funding for a project, as defined in the Act, must provide detailed information on the component(s) of the environment that will be affected, and any relevant planned mitigation measures, follow-up programs, and/or monitoring that will be put in place. NSERC's Guidelines on Environmental Review and Assessment can be found here: http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/policies-politiques/enviroassess-enviroeval_eng.asp.

For the period of April 1, 2017 to March 31, 2018, NSERC's review of seven projects concluded that none were likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects. In addition, NSERC was not the lead Federal Authority on any of the projects.

Oshawa Port Authority

For the review of projects as defined under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), the Oshawa Port Authority uses an Environmental Management Approach for planned projects on federal lands under its administration and control. The management approach enables the Oshawa Port Authority to conduct appropriate Environmental Effects Evaluations and Determination for projects located on Oshawa Port Authority federal lands, to satisfy the requirements of sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012.

Lower-risk activities that are routine and predictable, which incorporate effective and established mitigation measures and environmental best practices may require less analysis while higher-risk activities will require more detailed review and scrutiny. This approach ensures that projects receive a risk assessment and review that is commensurate with the level of risk and likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects with carrying out the project.

There were no projects determined as likely to result in having significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

Parks Canada Agency

Parks Canada's mandate is to protect and present nationally significant examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage for present and future generations. Parks Canada's Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) process supports achievement of this mandate as well as the requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

Parks Canada maximizes the effectiveness and efficiency of the EIA process by matching the depth of analysis to project risk. Best management practices are pre-approved impact assessments for a group of similar, routine projects with predictable effects. Basic impact analysis is used for projects of low-complexity, and detailed impact analysis is undertaken for complex projects with high levels of public concern. The alternate process is an integrated means of meeting CEAA 2012 requirements when a proposal is subject to another planning or permitting process approved by Parks Canada. No projects with likely significant adverse environmental effects were identified in 2017-2018.

Parks Canada's first alternate process for prescribed fire plans was approved in 2017. Site specific prescribed fire plans are developed to address ecological restoration and wildfire risk reduction priorities. Prescribed fire planning within Parks Canada has an existing internal evaluation and approval process. To avoid replicating information and duplicating approvals, the alternate process integrates components of the impact assessment into the prescribed fire template, which documents how the fire plan will be implemented. This enables efficiency while ensuring environmental protection.

Project Highlight 2017-2018

Sea level rise, coastal erosion and increasing storm intensity and frequency were elevating flood potential and the loss of cultural resources at the iconic Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Site. The Erosion and Flood Protection Project included beach stabilization via installation of two groynes at each end of the beach. The project will result in minimized flood risk and protection of infrastructure, cultural and archaeological resources, ecologically sensitive areas, and visitor experience.

Project activities such as dredging, shoreline excavation, installation of groynes, and placement of cobble beach fill material had the greatest likelihood to result in adverse environmental effects. The assessment focused largely on impacts to fish and fish habitat. Provincial and federal counterparts, the public, local fishers and the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia were engaged during the process. Parks Canada worked closely with Fisheries and Oceans Canada to develop a plan to offset impacts to fish and has identified a saltwater marsh restoration project within the site to fulfill this requirement.

Port Alberni Port Authority

The Port Alberni Port Authority (PAPA) employs an environmental management program that enables it to meet the requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). The program is focused on reviewing projects and activities that occur on federal lands within PAPA's administrative jurisdiction, thus satisfying the requirements of sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012. Inclusive of this environmental effects approach are contracts and leases managed between PAPA and its tenants as well as works that may be conducted by tenants.

Nearly all of the current and recent works conducted by PAPA and its tenants are deemed to be routine, low-risk and incorporate effective environmental best practices. These activities have been demonstrated to have no to little environmental impacts. The latter of which are managed through acceptable mitigation measures.

No projects and activities reviewed and monitored by PAPA during Fiscal Year 2018 were deemed to cause or were expected to cause adverse environmental effects that could not be managed through established and effective mitigation measures. A section 67 review was conducted as part of the development of a new marine spill response upland base (warehouse and office), marina to moor response vessels and rehabilitation of an adjacent wharf. No real or potential adverse environmental effects were found to result from the construction or operational plans for this project, which is expected to commence construction in the fall of 2018.

Prince Rupert Port Authority

The Prince Rupert Port Authority is responsible for managing federal property at the Port of Prince Rupert and for evaluating the environmental effects of projects to satisfy the requirements of section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). Reference material developed by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency guides the environmental effects evaluation process.

For the 2017 reporting period, all projects reviewed by the Prince Rupert Port Authority were considered unlikely to result in significant adverse environmental effects, or were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with the application of appropriate environmental mitigation.

An example of a project that was assessed pursuant to section 67 of CEAA 2012 is the replacement of a ferry terminal trestle and associated terminal upgrades which was constructed on portions of land administered by the Port Authority. Potential environmental impacts associated with the project included construction related noise and effects to water quality. For mitigation, best management practices for construction were employed and activities that could result in potential effects to water quality were isolated.

Public Health Agency of Canada

The Public Health Agency of Canada continues to ensure that it is meeting its obligations under section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) for activities related to real property on federal lands.

An internal procedure has been implemented that outlines the approach that project managers are to take in determining a project's likelihood to cause significant adverse environmental effects and in identifying proper mitigation measures. The procedure also identifies roles and responsibilities of the relevant parties.

The Public Health Agency of Canada did not have to perform section 67 determinations during this reporting period. The activities undertaken did not meet the definition of project under section 66 of the CEAA 2012 since they only involved maintenance, repairs, or upgrades to existing facilities and did not expand the footprint of any physical works.

Hence, there were no projects determined likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period.

Public Services and Procurement Canada

To ensure Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) complies with its obligations under sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), the Department continues to implement the PSPC National CEAA 2012 framework as a component of the departmental Environmental Compliance Management Program.

In order to render a CEAA 2012 determination the environmental services assessor reviews and analyzes the project information against established PSPC project risk criteria. Risks are divided into three categories: high, medium, and low. The level of assessment and subsequent mitigation measures correspond to the level of risk. All determinations are documented in the Environmental Services Ledger.

For the reporting period of 2017-18, no PSPC projects have been determined to pose significant adverse environmental effects, and, no projects have been referred to the Governor in Council. PSPC continues to provide CEAA 2012 advice and services to other federal departments and agencies.

Québec Port Authority

Governance

In 2017, Quebec Port Authority (QPA) began the implementation of its five-year sustainable development action plan. This action plan includes a total of 27 actions distributed according to three categories prescribed by the guide of good practices of the Worldwide network of port cities (AIVP), representing entrepreneur ports, citizen ports and urban ports. QPA's complete sustainable development action plan can be found at the following link: <https://www.portquebec.ca/communaute/developpement-durable/plan-daction-de-developpement-durable>.

Project evaluation

In order to meet the federal authorities' requirements under section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), QPA has evaluated all projects carried out on its territory by using the environmental citizen participation process (ECP), implemented in 2015. Although the majority of projects were considered without significant environmental effects in 2017, regarding QPA projects, two required an assessment of the environmental effects, which were:

- Simple repairs of the precast keys – Anse au Foulon area
- Bank Swallow nesting area relocation

The first QPA project consisting of simple repairs of precast keys is a fairly simple one for QPA and the potential effects are fully controlled. The second project, relocation of the bank swallow nesting area, has been worked on in close collaboration with the Canadian Wildlife Service due to its status under the *Species at Risk Act*. The construction of a nest box for Bank Swallows in the port sector of Beauport is a QPA voluntary initiative implemented in 2015 that was intended to help the recovery of the colony. Due to the success of the pilot project, in 2017, QPA has built a second birdhouse further eastward in order to establish a permanent installation. Environmental monitoring studies were conducted to ensure usage of this new infrastructure, and to identify and implement improvements where needed.

Moreover, in December 2017, QPA as a proponent announced to the the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and publicly that the multifunctional deep-water terminal (Beauport 2020), would be entirely dedicated to a container terminal. The project is currently under analysis through the CEAA 2012 process.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

During the 2017-2018 fiscal year, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) continued to implement the RCMP *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) process for evaluating the environmental effects of projects on federal lands in compliance with the CEAA 2012.

The RCMP had no projects outside Canada in fiscal year 2017-2018. In addition, there were no projects on federal lands where it was determined that significant adverse environmental effects were likely to occur.

In terms of the approach used in the RCMP, the organization has developed a risk based approach whereby projects considered to be very low risk of causing significant adverse environmental effects undergo a screening process and are excluded from further evaluation. This includes routine repairs and maintenance to existing buildings and projects that are conducted inside a building or structure.

Projects requiring a detailed evaluation are further broken down into levels of risk depending on various factors, including location, ecological sensitivity, physical activity (project type) or potential impact to Indigenous peoples. A follow up letter or report is required to document the implementation of mitigation measures. All projects must be in compliance with federal environmental legislation such as CEAA 2012, the *Fisheries Act*, *Species at Risk Act* and the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*.

As an example of this approach, during fiscal year 2017-2018, the RCMP completed the construction of the St. Leonard Detachment in New Brunswick. The work involved a geotechnical investigation, clearing and mulching as the land was forested, installation of water and sewer services to the municipal hook-up, the construction of the building and garages, installation of a generator for emergency power, and the creation of a parking lot.

To ensure compliance with the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*, land clearing activities were performed outside of the documented nesting period to avoid any potential interactions with established nests. Any existing nesting sites were visually inspected prior to initiating any physical work in order to not alter, disrupt, or destroy any existing nest or associated vegetation. A Species at Risk Assessment was also completed prior to construction to ensure critical habitats would not be affected by the construction. All work related to fuel storage tanks and halocarbons was performed in accordance with the *Storage Tank Systems for Petroleum Products and Allied Petroleum Products Regulations* and the *Federal Halocarbon Regulations*. Further mitigation measures were implemented to address increased erosion and runoff, the impacts of heavy equipment on the land, the management of construction wastes, the prevention of sensory disturbances, and to minimize the likelihood of and be prepared for accidental fuel releases.

Saguenay Port Authority

In all its activities, the *Saguenay Port Authority* ensures that its environmental policy is complied with. This policy establishes the environmental principles to be applied in the management of its facilities, activities and operations on its territory and the planning of future developments. It aims to ensure that activities are planned and implemented according to the following criteria: compliance with the law; preventing and reducing to a minimum any environmental impact; protecting the quality of the environment and a concern to promote sustainable development.

To this end, each new project which may have a negative impact on the environment is the subject of a detailed assessment and a study of the potential environmental impacts is performed using independent experts.

During 2017, no project was deemed likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Sept-Îles Port Authority

The Port of Sept-Îles (PSI) applies the approach set out in the guidance document with regards to section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) to determine whether a proposed project on its land is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. Following this process, PSI authorizes basic projects that have no anticipated environmental effects or for which effective and established mitigation measures can be applied. Projects likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects are subject to further assessment, particularly when they present a risk of releasing a polluting substance into the environment, to damage, disturb or destroy marine species, migratory birds, endangered species or their habitats, to deteriorate human health, property or land use, or raise public concerns.

In accordance with section 71 of CEAA 2012, the PSI has determined that for the period from April 1, 2017, to March 31, 2018, it did not undertake any projects on its land that were likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) is the federal research funding agency that promotes and supports research and research training in the humanities and social sciences. The management of SSHRC grants and awards funding is governed by the Tri-agency Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions (the Agreement), which outlines the responsibilities of institutions that are eligible to administer funding on behalf of SSHRC, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Eligible institutions include, but are not limited to, Canadian universities, colleges and research hospitals. The Agreement includes a requirement (section 4.8) that research institutions assist SSHRC in carrying out its responsibilities under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) by assisting applicants in preparing or commissioning documentation or reports that may be required and providing information upon request to assist SSHRC in meeting its obligations under CEAA 2012.

In this past fiscal year, no research funding administered by SSHRC was found to be a project as defined in CEAA 2012.

St. John's Port Authority

The St. John's Port Authority (SJPA) is committed to the protection of the environment. To that end, all projects undertaken by SJPA, or those projects undertaken by others for which SJPA must grant approval, are reviewed in accordance with a comprehensive Environmental Checklist. This review is to confirm there were not any significant adverse environmental effects identified, and that any short term effects will be mitigated through the use of proven practices and procedures.

In the fiscal year 2017-2018 the following projects were reviewed:

- 2018 Structural Repairs and Corrosion Mitigation Pier 18;
- Replacement of Existing CMP Sewer Pier Oceanex Terminal I;
- 2018 Structural repairs Pier 17, Piers 19/20/21, Marginal Wharf, and Harbourside Park; and,
- Marginal Wharf Fendering repairs 2018

Standards Council of Canada

The Standards Council of Canada (SCC) is a federal Crown corporation with a mandate to promote efficient and effective standardization in Canada. The organization reports to Parliament through the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and oversees Canada's national standardization network.

Further to requirements to report activities under sections 67 to 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, SCC does not undertake projects on federal lands or outside Canada.

Statistics Canada

While Statistics Canada does not typically support large scale economic capital ventures that would likely create environmental impacts, to ensure compliance with its obligations under sections 67 to 69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012), it has developed an internal operational process for evaluating project environmental impacts using the Treasury Board Policy on the Management of Projects and the Project Complexity and Risk Assessment. In addition, any external funding request through a Memorandum to Cabinet or a Treasury Board submission involves the completion of a Strategic Environmental Assessment questionnaire as required by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

The process outlines a risk-based approach for the assessment and reporting of environmental effects of projects proposed on federal lands that are subject to section 67 of CEAA 2012.

The Agency has determined that no projects carried out in 2017-2018 had cause for any significant environmental impact.

Thunder Bay Port Authority

The Thunder Bay Port Authority's Environmental Pledge guides its decisions and actions for the planning and development of the Port of Thunder Bay and commits its members and staff to environmental responsibility in the workplace.

The Thunder Bay Port Authority is required by section 67 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* to determine whether projects on federal lands are likely to cause significant effects.

This obligation applies when a Federal Authority proposes to carry out a project or before it exercises a power or performs a duty or function that could permit the project to proceed.

No project had the potential for significant adverse environmental effects during the 2017 calendar year.

Transport Canada

Transport Canada (TC) continues to meet its federal land obligations under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012) through the implementation of its Federal Lands Framework (FLF). The FLF clearly identifies the roles and responsibilities of all relevant parties in the completion of Environmental Effects Determinations (EEDs) for projects subject to section 67 of CEAA 2012. The EEDs are used to identify potential environmental effects of a proposed project involving federal lands and include measures to mitigate those effects. TC completed 150 EEDs during the 2017-18 fiscal year. None of the assessed projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

For example, TC conducted a federal lands assessment for the major restoration of its owned and operated False Bay Public Port Facility on Lasqueti Island, B.C. The project is located within a remote island community in the Northern Gulf Islands of Georgia Strait, which boasts rich marine biodiversity and thriving aquaculture of clams, geoducks, oysters, and honey mussels. Since its construction, the False Bay wharf has provided a major link to other population centres for residents and businesses on the island. The restoration project resulted in the replacement of major components of the wharf structure including, piles, dolphins, floats, gangway, and handrails. To minimize impacts to the environment, such as harm to fish and fish habitat, decreased water quality, and sensory disturbance of wildlife, best management practices for pile driving and for the construction of docks and floats were applied (e.g., implementing exclusion areas or bubble curtains to reduce acoustic impacts). The wharf repairs were also carried out during recommended timing windows to protect spawning fish.

Under the department's internal Environmental Management System, TC continues to improve its FLF and the quality of its EEDs by undertaking project reviews through its Federal Lands Framework Quality Assurance Program (QAP). The QAP is designed to review the implementation of the FLF, identify efficiencies and provide recommendations to improve the framework itself. Systematic regional evaluations are conducted across TC to highlight the types of projects that are being carried out, determine procedural best practices, support regional improvement, identify areas where additional guidance may be needed, ensure reviews are compliant with CEAA 2012, and ensure consistency across all TC regions.

Trois-Rivières Port Authority

The Trois-Rivières Port Authority's (TRPA) environmental management system ensures compliance with the requirements of sections 67-69 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). In accordance with section 71 of CEAA 2012, the TRPA assessed one project for the January 1, 2017, to December 31, 2018, reporting period.

TRPA determinations are based on the guidance distributed by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and on a review of policies, plans, processes or procedures, roles and responsibilities, audit and feedback and continual improvement mechanisms. A procedure exists for all projects undertaken by the TRPA to ensure that environmental effects are assessed for any project or work executed on port of Trois-Rivières' property.

Although TRPA began planning in 2017, it is during 2018 and 2019 that the bulk terminal optimization project will be completed. The project includes the development of a storage area, the installation of a rainwater treatment system and the addition of a railway line. TRPA mandated an external consultant to carry out an environmental assessment for this project carried out on federal lands.

As revealed by the EA, the construction activities related to the project could generate some negative effects but these will be mitigated through specific measures established to reduce their importance. The potential effects are primarily associated with risks of oil spills during transport, traffic and operation of construction machinery. Thus, after the application of standard best practices of environmental protection and specific and applied mitigation measures, findings show that the construction of the projet will not cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Furthermore, procedures have been developed to ensure that issues, regulatory requirements and environmental aspects are taken into account as part of the management of contracts and leases signed with tenants, and also where work is executed by tenants.

Vancouver Fraser Port Authority

The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority (VFPA) is committed to conducting its operations in a responsible, environmentally sustainable, and transparent manner that safeguards and, where feasible and practicable, promotes continuous improvement.

As required by VFPA's policies, environmental reviews are conducted on all projects, physical works and activities within or partially within port authority managed lands and waters to address VFPA's responsibilities under the *Canada Marine Act* and meet the requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, as applicable. Reviews consider the potential adverse environmental effects on land, air and water quality as a result of a project. Based on the scope of a project, the review includes assessment of effects on fish and fish habitat, aquatic species, migratory birds, health and socio-economic conditions, physical and cultural heritage and the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.

The port authority works with proponents in advance of a formal review to avoid reviews of non-viable projects. In 2017, 220 projects underwent a formal review through the VFPA Project and Environmental Review process, and 219 were either considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with the application of appropriate mitigation measures, or were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. A full list of the projects reviewed is provided on VFPA's website at:

<http://www.portvancouver.com/environment/environmental-reviews/>.

For one project reviewed in 2017, VFPA concluded that even with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, the project was likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. The proposed project consisted of the installation of a new two-slip, shared recreational dock in an environmentally sensitive area located within 30 meters of an Aboriginal reserve and adjacent to a known archaeological site, the boundaries of which encompassed the proposed project location. As no technically or economically feasible measures were available to mitigate the residual adverse effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes by Aboriginal groups, VFPA concluded that the project must not be carried out and the project permit application was denied. The project was not referred to Governor in Council for a determination on the justification of effects.

Included in VFPA's list of projects reviewed are numerous projects that involve construction on, and operation of, marine terminals designed to handle ships larger than 25,000 dead weight tonnes. These projects are located on terminals that are routinely and have been historically used as a marine terminal and have been designated for this use in a land use plan that has been the subject of extensive public consultation.

In 2017, VFPA continued work to develop an improved permit compliance monitoring program. Key objectives of the program include: more effective monitoring of compliance with permit conditions; formalizing permit compliance expectations; providing tools to communicate effectively between the port authority and permit holders; and, helping to ensure fair and consistent responses to instances of permit non-compliance.

Western Economic Diversification Canada

The department of Western Economic Diversification (WD) has employed guidance circulated by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency to ensure a consistent approach to assessments under sections 67-69 of *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

WD assesses each project to ensure compliance with CEAA 2012 before approving a funding contribution. If required, WD accesses expertise and guidance from partner organizations to conduct environmental effects evaluations under section 67 of CEAA 2012 for all projects on federal lands. The assessments and guidance obtained inform WD's determinations under CEAA 2012.

In 2017-2018, WD approved funding for seven projects that fell on federal lands (or outside Canada). All projects on federal lands that have received a contribution from WD were determined not likely to have significant adverse environmental effects.

Further information on WD's projects can be found at <http://www.wd-deo.gc.ca/>.

Windsor Port Authority

In accordance with section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*, the Windsor Port Authority (WPA) advises that from April 1, 2017 to March 31, 2018, projects administered by WPA, that took into account the implementation of mitigation measures as prescribed by expert advisors/consultants, were determined to not likely cause significant adverse environmental effects. Determinations are based on the guidance as distributed by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and a review of policies, plans, processes or procedures, roles and responsibilities, audit and feedback and continual improvement mechanisms.

An example of a project reviewed during the reporting period by WPA includes having received an application from a local organization requesting a permit to conduct shore wall replacement works. The organization is located along the Detroit River within WPA jurisdictional boundaries. The application was reviewed, including a permit attained from Ministry of Natural Resource (Essex Region Conservation Authority), and it was determined that the proposed project did not have any adverse environmental effects. Additional information is available at the WPA office upon request.