



Government
of Canada

Gouvernement
du Canada

2018-2019 Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under Section 71 of
the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*

Canada

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, 2019.

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 Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3, or ceaa.information.acee@canada.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 2018-2019*

Alternative formats may be requested by contacting: ceaa.information.acee@canada.ca

Foreword to the 2018-2019 Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*

On August 28, 2019, the *Impact Assessment Act* (IAA) came into force and repealed the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012). However, for activities carried out on federal lands and outside Canada for the 2018-2019 period to which CEAA 2012 applies, reports under section 71 of CEAA 2012 will continue to be provided.

Federal authorities must table an annual report in Parliament in order to meet their section 71 obligation under CEAA 2012. This consolidated report entitled “2018-2019 Reports by Federal Authorities with Obligations under section 71 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012*” 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. The federal authorities that have included their reports in this consolidated report satisfy this obligation. Other federal authorities that have an existing mechanism for reporting to Parliament, typically an annual report, should have satisfied this obligation through that mechanism. This is the seventh consolidated report tabled in Parliament since the implementation of CEAA 2012. For activities that continue under CEAA 2012, future reports may be tabled. Under the IAA, project-specific notification is required. As a result, annual reporting to Parliament is not required under the IAA.

The majority of CEAA 2012 focusses on environmental assessments of ‘designated projects’. However, CEAA 2012 also includes provisions to ensure that projects on federal lands and outside Canada are considered in a careful and precautionary manner. Sections 66-69 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 former 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 Impact Assessment Agency of Canada 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. Questions with respect to the information provided in these reports are best answered by the relevant 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
Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario – Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada	22
Fisheries and Oceans Canada.....	23
Global Affairs Canada	24
Halifax Port Authority.....	25
Hamilton Port Authority	26
Health Canada.....	27
Infrastructure Canada.....	28
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada	29
Jacques Cartier & Champlain Bridges Inc.	30

Montreal Port Authority	31
Nanaimo Port Authority	32
National Research Council	33
Natural Resources Canada	34
Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada	35
Oshawa Port Authority	36
Parks Canada Agency	37
Port Alberni Port Authority	38
Prince Rupert Port Authority	39
Public Health Agency of Canada	40
Public Services and Procurement Canada	41
Québec Port Authority	42
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	43
Saguenay Port Authority	44
Sept-Îles Port Authority	45
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council	46
St. John's Port Authority	47
Standards Council of Canada	48
Statistics Canada	49
Thunder Bay Port Authority	50
Transport Canada	51
Trois-Rivières Port Authority	52
Vancouver Fraser Port Authority	53
Western Economic Diversification Canada	55
Windsor Port Authority	56

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

This is Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's (AAFC) seventh report to be tabled in Parliament, for activities on federal lands and outside Canada, in accordance with section 71 of CEAA 2012.

To facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012, AAFC implements a risk-based approach to the environmental evaluation of departmental activities on federal lands and outside Canada. The approach is based on guidance provided by the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. The approach ensures consistency in the application of CEAA 2012 to departmental activities, and that environmental risks are assessed in advance of any project being carried out. AAFC categorizes projects into those having low, moderate or high environmental risk. Based on risk criteria, Departmental officials make a 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, 2018 and March 31, 2019, AAFC determined that no project was likely to have significant adverse environmental effects and did not refer any projects to the Governor in Council.

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) has implemented a thorough approach to evaluating environmental impacts under sections 67-69 of 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 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 2018-19 involved the proposed construction of an active ventilation stack on AECL's Chalk River Laboratory site, located 200 kilometres west of Ottawa in the province of Ontario. The primary purpose of the ventilation stack was to redirect exhaust gases from an existing stack associated with a building that is slated for decommissioning.

Activities related to the proposed Project included the modification of active ventilation ducts with suspect contamination as well as work that would potentially involve species at risk or their habitat. The Project and the CNL Environmental Protection staff developed appropriate mitigation measures to be implemented if the Project proceeds. The measures required to mitigate risk during work involving suspect contamination include a commitment to ensure that all waste generated during the modification of the ventilation system shall be screened and disposed of according to the facility and Project's waste management plan. Measures required to prevent adverse impact to species at risk involve integration of a new ventilation stack in the Project's design which must include a metal liner and a crown to impede the ingress of chimney swifts (a species at risk) into the stack. All plans for the construction of the stack were required to be reviewed by CNL's Environmental Biodiversity Specialist prior to design approval. Taking into account the implementation of the specified mitigation measures, it was determined that no significant adverse environmental effects were likely as a result of these Project activities.

In the fiscal year 2018-2019, no projects conducted at AECL sites were determined to have likely significant adverse environmental effects. Additional information on environmental performance at AECL sites (operated by CNL) 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*, CEEA 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 2018 fiscal year, the Port of Belledune initiated or completed the following projects:

- Construction of an Asphalt Storage Pad on Terminal 3;
- Construction of a Wood Chip Storage Site on Belledune Port Authority Land;
- Bulk petroleum storage tank no. 4 floor replacement; and,
- Terminal 1 refurbishment project initiated (multi-year project).

Additional information is available at the Port of Belledune's website available at <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, Business Development Bank of Canada (BDC) has a rigorous governance structure in place.

BDC's governance structure comprises a Directive on the Environment Risk Management approved by the President and Chief Executive Officer. Emanating from this directive are detailed procedures, business rules, processes, and tools that ensure that these principles and objectives are achieved. BDC's directive, 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 CEAA 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, 2019, 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 CEAA 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 the 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 Evaluation, 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. All assessments are reviewed by the CBSA Environmental Operations Division, which also maintains an inventory of all assessments, including records of decision.

Project Highlight: Water Treatment and Fire Pump Upgrades

The scope of work for this project included the installation of a new water treatment system, upgrades to the electromechanical systems and storage, and upgrades to the fire pump system at a large Port of Entry in the Quebec Region. The area surrounding the work site is forested to the east and west, with roadway and infrastructure to the north and south.

Potential adverse effects of this work included the potential removal or disturbance of vegetation, the removal of water for purposes other than sampling, and the potential for soil or water contamination. All of these potential impacts were outlined in the Environmental Effects Evaluation.

Due to the potential risks involved, the project was deemed medium-risk. However, the natural features in the project area were considered to be non-sensitive, and the potential risks could be easily identified and properly managed. An environmental effects letter was shared with internal and external stakeholders, which outlined the mitigation measures in place to reduce risks to the environment.

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 67-69 of CEAA 2012 before approving a financial contribution. Generally, projects funded by CED are unlikely to have an environmental impact.

During the fiscal year 2018-19, three active projects were assessed, none of them had undesirable environmental impact requiring mitigation measures.

CED ensures that the governance mechanism put in place to comply with CEAA 2012, including projects on federal lands, is consistent with the former 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 67-69 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 CED has previously identified potential adverse environmental effects. 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 CEAA 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 2018-2019, the CFIA did not undertake any projects with the potential for negative environmental effects.

Canadian Heritage

In response to its obligations outlined in 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 former 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, installation of public art, the construction, renovation or expansion of sporting facilities, schools or cultural buildings. Determinations made in 2018-2019 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 2018, the *Dialogue* public art project on the plaza near the Alexandra Bridge in Ottawa was one for which it was determined that, with the implementation of mitigation measures, it was not likely to cause adverse environmental effects.

The project was situated at the Alexandra upper bridge plaza, where an illuminated artwork would be showcased for two years. The artwork, 12 feet in height, involved anchoring to the ground and emitting a small amount of light. There were no environmental concerns regarding the small amount of light due to the existing ambient light within the area. The anchoring of the artwork involved coring, drilling, grinding, blasting, crushing and sandblasting silica-containing materials (such as concrete and masonry).

The presence of silica dust had the greatest likelihood to result in adverse environmental effects. Mitigation measures were identified, incorporated in the project and implemented during construction to ensure that the time-weighted average (TWA) exposure of a worker to silica was reduced to the lowest practical level and, at a minimum, met TWA regulation limits. These measures included engineering controls, work practices, and hygiene practices and facilities.

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 CEAA 2012. Given that CIHR is a federal health research funding agency and does not conduct its own research, projects falling under the Act 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 2018-2019, 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. CanNor supports the development and diversification of the northern economy in the territories. CanNor's Northern Projects Management Office co-ordinates federal regulations and oversees Indigenous consultations for major resource projects in the territories.

In the territories, CEAA 2012 only applies in the Inuvialuit Settlement Area. During the 2018-2019 fiscal year, CanNor did not carry out a project on federal lands, or exercise any power or perform any duty or function conferred on it under any Act of Parliament that could permit a project to be carried out, in whole or in part, on federal lands within the Inuvialuit Settlement Area. As such, CanNor does not have any activities to report pursuant to section 71 of CEAA 2012.

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 CEEA 2012, and requiring a decision by the CNSC as the federal authority, the Commission must also determine, in accordance with section 67 of CEEA 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 2018-2019, the CNSC did not receive any application for projects subject to section 67 of CEEA 2012.

Canadian Space Agency

Pursuant to 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's (PSPC) Environmental Compliance Management Program checklist. Projects involving listed activities are then referred to PSPC for complete review and analysis. As necessary, PSPC provides 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.

During the fiscal year 2018-2019, no CSA projects were deemed to pose any significant 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 Canadian tourism industry in ten countries around the world to promote Canada as a premier travel and meeting destination.

To facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of 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 fiscal year 2018-2019, 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 the fiscal year 2018-2019, 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 CEAA 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 2018-2019, 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 – *Federal 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 CEAA 2012, Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs and Indigenous Services Canada reviewed projects and considered their environmental effects including effects on Indigenous peoples, prior to the issuance of a permit, lease, licence or other authorization.

For projects south of 60° on-reserve, the department's Environmental Review Process (the 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 applied 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 reviewed each project on a case-by-case basis to determine if there were any adverse environmental impacts or impacts to Indigenous peoples as per paragraph 5 (1)(c) of CEAA 2012.

The 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 2018-2019, 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 at www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1345141628060/1345141658639.

Department of National Defence

Under 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 2018-2019, 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 develops effective mitigation measures to address them. For lower risk activities, an Abbreviated Reporting Criteria has been established to streamline compliance of frequently recurring projects.

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 supports 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)
- Smaller scale new building construction – typically one or two story buildings for homeless shelters

In order to facilitate compliance with sections 67-69 of CEAA 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 in the fiscal year 2018-2019 are not expected to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Environment and Climate Change Canada

This is Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) seventh report tabled in Parliament for activities on federal lands and outside of Canada in accordance with section 71 of CEAA 2012.

During fiscal year 2018-2019, 35 projects were reviewed. No projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects. In some cases environmental mitigation measures were applied to reduce effects.

Pursuant to CEAA 2012, ECCC has developed internal operational processes to evaluate projects on federal lands or outside Canada in relation to a physical work and that are not designated projects. These projects are assessed to determine if there is the potential for significant adverse environmental effects, and to identify measures to mitigate adverse effects, if required. To ensure effective determination of environmental effects, each project was reviewed by an environmental assessment expert. This approach is aligned with ECCC's mandate for the preservation and enhancement of the quality of the natural environment, conservation of Canada's renewable resources and coordination of environmental policies and programs.

The Smooth Rock Falls Weather Radar Replacement is an example of a project assessed under this process during the 2018-2019 fiscal year. This project will ensure ECCC can continue to provide Canadians with the weather information they need to make informed decisions to protect their health, safety, and security.

This project was carried out on federal lands and involved construction and decommissioning of radar systems. The potential adverse environmental effects that were evaluated included impacts to wildlife, land, water and air. To reduce impacts, a number of mitigation measures (as defined in CEAA 2012) were proposed, such as provision of spill response kits and minimization of vegetation destruction and noise emissions.

The environmental effects analysis included expert advice from ECCC's Corporate Services and Finance Branch regarding greening and environmental programs. The assessment determined that the project was not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with implementation of mitigation measures. The project has been implemented based on the evaluations with the mitigation measures proposed.

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 maintains a contract with Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) 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 2018-19, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario – Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada

The Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario (FedNor) assesses all projects on federal lands for environmental effects to ensure compliance with sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012. This is done through procedural requirements to determine whether significant adverse environmental effects will be caused by a project funded by FedNor. FedNor's assessment process is consistent with guidelines guidance provided by the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency to ensure a uniform approach to assessments under sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012.

The environmental impact of projects is assessed before approving a funding contribution. Measures to mitigate identified environmental impacts are included in the authority documents allowing the project to proceed. For fiscal year 2018-2019, 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 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 Fish and Fish Habitat 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.

We demonstrate due diligence in decision-making under sections 67-69 of CEEA 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 2018-2019 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 https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/publications/sea-ees/sustainable-durable.aspx?lang=eng&_ga=2.80991764.223738347.1499698631-636809869.1498153599.

Halifax Port Authority

The Halifax Port Authority is required by section 67 of 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 departmental 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 reporting period of April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019.

Health Canada

Health Canada continues to ensure that it is meeting its obligations under Section 67 of CEEA 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.

Infrastructure Canada

During the 2018-2019 fiscal year, there were no projects for which Infrastructure Canada was the lead federal authority as per section 67 of CEAA 2012. However, Infrastructure Canada continued to carry out its internal environmental determination process for infrastructure projects submitted for federal funding approval. This process was used to identify 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 granting federal funds.

With respect to fulfilling section 67 requirements, the process continued to involve the following activities over the 2018-2019 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, 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 CEEA 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 2018-2019, no projects were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

Jacques Cartier & Champlain Bridges Inc.

The Jacques Cartier and Champlain Bridges Incorporated (JCCBI) ensures the mobility of users, and the safety and longevity of infrastructure using a systemic management approach based on sustainable development. The JCCBI ensures a safe drive for thousands of users by managing, maintaining and repairing important infrastructure for Greater Montreal Area.

The JCCBI conducts several maintenance projects annually to ensure the durability of the assets under its supervision. This work is carried out following an evaluation conducted in accordance with CEAA 2012. JCCBI's project management processes include environmental risk analysis at the early stages of projects and, depending on the level of project risk, environmental assessments conducted either internally or externally.

During fiscal year 2018-2019, JCCBI evaluated a dozen projects under CEAA 2012. For instance, the project to repair some piers and abutments under the Jacques-Cartier Bridge has been analyzed. This contract included the installation of temporary access works, the modification of drainage equipment, earthworks, repair work on the reinforced concrete columns, piles and abutments, the installation of optical fibers, and development and refurbishment work.

The effects of the project on soil quality, due to excavation, the passage of machinery and possible spills among other things, as well as the effects on air quality due to increased dust during works, have been considered as more important and have been subjected to numerous mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts as much as possible. Measures have also been applied to minimize the effects on fauna and flora in the various work areas and on user comfort (security and ease of movement). These specific measures coupled with the current measures have allowed JCCBI to decide to proceed with the project as it would not generate significant adverse environmental impacts.

Montreal Port Authority

The Montreal Port Authority (MPA)'s environmental management system ensures compliance with the requirements of sections 67-69 of CEAA 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 also where work is executed by tenants. In addition, there is a similar procedure for all projects executed by the 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, the MPA completed the first phase of a \$78-million project for the rehabilitation of the Alexandra Pier and Iberville Passenger Terminal. The main objectives of this project were to rehabilitate century old infrastructure and to improve the reception for cruise passengers arriving in Montreal. The 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, the MPA has completed an innovative electrical shore power supply system project for cruise ships, thereby significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In 2019, the MPA began the second phase of the project, the construction of a tower that will complete this Montreal maritime signature for 2021 (Project C).

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 tourist 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, the 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 the MPA during the period, none were found 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 CEAA 2012. Environmental effects assessments and determinations 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.

An example of a project that was assessed pursuant to section 67 of CEAA 2012 was the modification of existing Port terminal facilities to accommodate a vehicle processing centre. The project involved upgrades to an existing 60,000 square foot warehouse, shallow earth works for upgrading civil works, utilities, paving, security fencing and landscaping. Marine upgrades included berth fender and bollard upgrades, gangway improvements and a new mooring dolphin to accommodate 200 metre roll-on/roll-off vessels delivering vehicles to the terminal. Potential environmental impacts associated with the project included construction related noise and effects to water quality. Best management practices for construction were employed along with isolation of activities that could result in potential effects on water quality.

National Research Council

The National Research Council of Canada's (NRC) organizational and reporting structure helps ensure compliance with sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012. NRC's Health, Safety and Environment Branch (HSEB) 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 are considered, and potential environmental effects are 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 the 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 its 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 during the fiscal year 2018-19 were determined to have the potential for significant adverse environmental effects.

An example of an NRC project reviewed by the HSEB in fiscal year 2018-19 was the construction of a paved parking lot at building M-48 on the NRC Montreal Road Campus in Ottawa. The project review was completed prior to the construction of the paved parking lot in fall 2018.

The proposed work consisted of stripping and grubbing an approximately 22 meters by 22 meters area of green space extending from the existing M-48 building footprint. Site preparation included the removal of several small trees from a previously disturbed area. The area was then paved with asphalt and fenced. Mitigation measures were recommended through NRC's Project Environmental Review process to ensure that the proposed work did not result in significant adverse environmental effects. These include a pre-construction visual inspection for wildlife, avoidance of plant species at risk, revegetation measures, appropriate storm water management and construction occurring outside of regional migratory bird nesting period.

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 Canada. When appropriate, NRCan collaborates with other departments on joint projects and projects requiring broader federal review, to make determinations under sections 66-69 of CEAA 2012. Projects reviewed in 2018-2019 were located in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia and included the construction and operation of solar and wind power, sawmill upgrades and recommissioning, biofuels production, installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, and production of essential oils from forestry byproducts.

All of the projects assessed in the 2018-2019 reporting period were determined to have negligible environmental risk.

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 Canada. These applications are reviewed to determine whether they constitute a project as defined under 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 CEAA 2012, 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 at http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/NSERC-CRSNG/policies-politiques/enviroassess-enviroeval_eng.asp

For the period of April 1, 2018, to March 31, 2019, NSERC's review of sixteen 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 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 Determinations 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 associated with the carrying out the project.

There were no projects determined as likely to result in 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 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. 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 2018-2019.

With most of the necessary training, tools, and policies having been put in place in previous years, 2018-2019 saw a stronger focus on improving knowledge sharing amongst impact assessment practitioners who work throughout Parks Canada's protected heritage areas. This included formalizing our impact assessment community of practice and developing guiding principles. Eight webinars were hosted throughout the year with presentations from internal and external specialists on various impact assessment topics. Governance work was largely focused on preparing for the transition to the *Impact Assessment Act* in 2019.

Project Highlight 2018-2019

Project: The construction of a new 1.6 kilometres stretch of fence in the East Block of Grasslands National Park was necessary to help manage grazing as part of the work to maintain and restore ecological integrity in the park.

Potential adverse effects and mitigations: The proposed project had the potential to negatively affect several species at risk associated with the grasslands ecosystem, and hinder wildlife movement. Mitigation was incorporated into the fence design to permit wildlife movement (over or under the fence); to limit the likelihood of collision mortality or increased predator pressure on Greater Sage Grouse, an endangered species; and to avoid disturbance of sensitive vegetation. The more routine effects were mitigated by using selected standard mitigations from a Parks Canada Best Management Practice and from the Fisheries and Oceans Canada measures to avoid harm.

Port Alberni Port Authority

The Port Alberni Port Authority (PAPA) employs an environmental management program that enables it to meet the requirements of 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.

Of all the projects and activities reviewed and monitored by PAPA during fiscal year 2018 none 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 was expected to commence construction in the fall of 2018. The revised project commencement date is now the fall of 2019. Given the delay, PAPA confirmed with the proponent that no new Review is required as material conditions have not changed.

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 CEAA 2012. Reference material developed by the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency guides the environmental effects evaluation process.

For the 2018 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 construction of a raised pedestrian promenade between the Northlands Cruise Terminal and the Atlin Terminal which was constructed on 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 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 determined that there were no projects likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects during this reporting period. The activities undertaken only involved maintenance, repairs, or upgrades to existing facilities and did not expand the footprint of any physical works.

Public Services and Procurement Canada

To ensure Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) complies with its obligations under sections 67-69 of 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 2018-2019, no PSPC projects have been determined to pose significant adverse environmental effects, and, no projects have been referred to the Governor in Council. PSPC will continue to provide advice and services to other federal departments and agencies related to the new *Impact Assessment Act*.

Québec Port Authority

In 2018, the Quebec Port Authority (QPA) was in its first year of implementation of its 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, representing entrepreneur ports, citizen ports and urban ports. QPA's 2018 action plan summary can be found at the following link: https://www.portquebec.ca/documents/on-sengage/on-a-une-vision-durable/demarche-de-developpement-durable/Document_Evolution_PADD2018.pdf

Project evaluation

In order to meet the federal authorities' requirements under section 67 of CEAA 2012, QPA has evaluated all projects carried out on its territory by using the Environmental Citizen Participation Process (ECPP), implemented in 2015. Although the majority of projects were considered without significant environmental effects in 2018, regarding QPA projects, two required an assessment of the environmental effects and a public consultation based on the ECPP, as follows:

- Construction of a permanent cruise terminal in Estuaire sector
- Upgrade of the Anse au Foulon sector

The first QPA project consisting of building a permanent cruise terminal in Estuaire sector has no important effects on the environment. The project assessment did not include cruise activities because the vessels were already coming at berth and the project was to build a permanent infrastructure in order to replace the temporary one already utilized during the cruise season to welcome visitors. There was no work in the water associated with this project. The second project is a grouping of four smaller projects, which all aimed to upgrade the infrastructure of the Anse au Foulon sector. More precisely those activities consisted of the refectation and stabilization of wharf 107, upgrade of the rail yard, upgrade of the water and sewer systems and redesign of most access points to the territory. Environmental monitoring studies were conducted to identify and implement mitigation measures where needed during the work.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

During the 2018-2019 fiscal year, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) continued to implement the *RCMP Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* process for evaluating the environmental effects of projects on federal lands in compliance with CEAA 2012.

The RCMP had no projects outside Canada in fiscal year 2018-2019. 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, 1994*.

As an example of this approach, during fiscal year 2018-2019, the RCMP completed the construction of a Detachment in New Minas, Nova Scotia. The site area was covered by grass, gravel, shrubs and pavement. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) impacted soil, present on the steep slope on the Northern edge of the property was surrounded by trees. This soil was capped in-place to avoid unnecessary damage to the trees and consequential erosion of the bank. Given the site cover, no disruption to species at risk or related critical habitat was expected to be disturbed as a result of the construction and auxiliary site development activities. The work involved grading, excavation, building the structure, backfilling and landscaping. Environmental impacts such as increased runoff/sedimentation resulting from soil disturbance and changes to landscape, disturbance of PAH impacted soil, and accidental spills had the greatest likelihood to result in adverse environmental effects. An environmental protection plan was created and approval was obtained from Storm Drainage Works, Nova Scotia Department of Environment, to mitigate the potential impact of increased runoff and sedimentation. A risk management plan was implemented to mitigate the capped PAH impacted soil and monthly inspections were documented to ensure the capped soil was not disturbed throughout construction. Lastly a site specific spill response plan was prepared to mitigate the impacts of accidental spills.

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 2018, no project was deemed likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.

Sept-Îles Port Authority

The Sept-Îles Port Authority (SIPA) relies on the approach set out in the guidance document regarding section 67 of CEAA 2012 on making a determination as to whether a proposed project on federal land is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. The SIPA makes a decision to authorize, or not, basic projects that have no anticipated environmental effects, the ones for which effective and established mitigation measures can be applied and projects likely to 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 that are subject to further assessment.

For the period from April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019, the following projects have been the subject of an environmental effects assessment by the SIPA:

- The construction of new conveyor at Pointe-Noire installations was authorized in December 2018. Air and water quality are valued components that may represent challenges for this project. To reduce impacts on air and water quality, all transfer points will be enclosed, a curved drop system and skirting technology will be incorporated into the loading equipment and the conveyor will be covered to control material drops and dust emissions. Operating procedures included limits depending on weather conditions such as strong wind or heavy rain.
- The rehabilitation of the Pointe-aux-Basques wharf, authorized in July 2018, mainly involves installing a new sheet piles wall in front of the face of the existing wharf. As an option for the project, the expansion of the actual wharf by backfilling on the seabed and extending the sheet piles wall facade. The project therefore implies permanent encroachment in the marine environment. Fisheries and Oceans Canada considers that the project should not cause serious harm to fish or listed aquatic species at risk, if required mitigation measures are applied, such as a restriction period to not perform any work in water (vibrating, threshing) between May 1 and July 15, to protect the spring feeding season from cetaceans and after that to stop work when a cetacean is observed within 200 metres and wait until it leaves the area.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (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 that research institutions assist SSHRC in carrying out its responsibilities under 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.

For the period April 1, 2018, to March 31, 2019, SSHRC's review of its one project concluded that it was not likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects. In addition, SSHRC was not the lead Federal Authority on the project.

St. John's Port Authority

The St. John's Port Authority is committed to the protection of the environment; to that end, all projects undertaken by the Port Authority, or those projects undertaken by others of which the Port Authority 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 proven practices and procedures.

During the period of April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019 the following projects were reviewed:

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

Standards Council of Canada

The Standards Council of Canada (SCC) is a federal Crown corporation. It has its 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 67-69 of CEEA 2012, the 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 67-69 of CEEA 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 of 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 CEEA 2012.

Statistic Canada has determined that no projects carried out during the fiscal year 2018-2019 caused 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 CEAA 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 2018-2019 fiscal year.

Transport Canada

Transport Canada (TC) continues to meet its federal land obligations under 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. Of the projects TC assessed during the 2018-2019 fiscal year, none were determined likely to result in significant adverse environmental effects.

For example, TC conducted a federal lands assessment for the restoration of the Walpole Island Ferry Terminal crash wall. The terminal is owned and maintained by TC and services a year-round ferry operation that provides a vital transportation service between the United States and Canada and to the Walpole Island First Nation. The ferry terminal crash wall is a key piece of infrastructure, which supports and absorbs impact loads from ferries when they dock. Deterioration of the wall had been identified as a potential safety issue, and restoration was a priority project for TC. Project work involved the installation of wooden piles to hold the wall, driven into the river bottom on the north side of the timber jetty. An environmental review was conducted to identify environmental risks of the proposed works and the appropriate mitigation to manage them. Mitigation measures included bubble curtains to keep fish out of the area during work, monitoring of fish, onsite emergency spill kits, as well as the use of untreated and environmentally-friendly materials. Through this review process, TC was able to advance the project in a timely manner, while simultaneously ensuring the protection of fish, fish habitat and water quality in the vicinity of the works.

During the 2018-2019 fiscal year, under the department's internal Environmental Management System, TC concluded regional evaluations as part of its FLF Quality Assurance Program (QAP). The QAP was designed to review the implementation of the FLF, identify efficiencies and provide recommendations to improve the framework itself. Systematic regional evaluations were 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 assessments are compliant with CEAA 2012, and ensure consistency across all TC regions. The results of the QAP are being implemented as TC continues to improve its FLF and the quality of its EEDs.

Trois-Rivières Port Authority

The Trois-Rivières Port Authority (TRPA) environmental management system enables ensuring compliance with the requirements of sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012. In accordance with section 71 of CEAA 2012, the TRPA reports that it has not authorized any project with potential adverse environmental effects from April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019.

TRPA decisions are based on the guidance distributed by the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency in 2014, and on a review of policies, plans, processes or procedures, roles and responsibilities, audit and feedback and continual improvement mechanisms. To ensure the proper assessment of the environmental effects of all projects carried out in the Port of Trois-Rivières, the TRPA applies a structured process to guide the decision and to verify if a project is likely to lead to significant adverse environmental effects.

Throughout its decision-making process, TRPA applies a set of principles including the application of professional judgment at each stage of the process to ensure the protection of the environment; the investment of an adequate level of risk analysis effort in the process of assessing the probability of significant adverse environmental effects; taking into account similar previous projects; cooperation between all involved parties; a preventative approach to avoid significant adverse environmental effects and a respect of sustainable development values.

Project Highlights

The TRPA has previously reported the project to optimize its bulk terminals. The project included the development of new storage areas, the installation of a rainwater treatment system and the addition of a railway line. An environmental assessment conducted by an external consultant concluded that construction activities related to the project could have some negative effects but that they would be mitigated by specific measures. The project was completed in 2018, in accordance with the objectives, timescale, regulatory requirements and accepted environmental effects. The mitigation measures were implemented as planned.

The TRPA operates within a framework of contracts and leases with terminal tenants. The TRPA can receive at any time an authorization request for small to large-scale projects by these tenants. In accordance with the requirements of sections 67-69 of CEAA 2012, and after the complete review process of the tenant's project, the TRPA provides the tenant with its decision as to whether or not to authorize the completion of the projects based on its assessment of the risk and likelihood of the project to cause significant negative environmental impacts. No request for an authorization decision was made to the TRPA during the reporting period.

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 CEAA 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 VFPA applies its Project and Environmental Review process to projects in its jurisdiction, which enables the port authority to undertake effective, robust and transparent environmental reviews to meet regulatory obligations under CEAA 2012.

Between January 1 and December 31, 2018, all of the projects reviewed by VFPA were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, or were considered unlikely to cause significant adverse environmental effects with the application of appropriate environmental mitigation. A full list of the projects reviewed is provided on VFPA's website at: <http://www.portvancouver.com/environment/environmental-reviews/>.

By way of example, in April 2018, the port authority issued a project permit for the Centerm Expansion Project in Vancouver. The project includes a series of improvements at the existing Centerm container terminal and port roads to help meet anticipated demand for containers shipped through Vancouver. The improvements will increase terminal capacity from 900,000 20-foot equivalent units (TEUs) to 1.5 million TEUs annually. To increase the footprint at the terminal, infilling of a portion of Burrard Inlet was proposed on either side of the terminal. The port authority also conducted a review of the habitat offsetting project under a separate permit that will be used to offset the impacts of the Centerm Project.

In its review of the Centerm project, the port authority reviewed proposed mitigation measures including protection of surface water through a turbidity monitoring plan and use of a silt curtain during infilling and dredging activities, implementation of sediment and erosion control measures and storm water management during upland construction activities, and replanting impacted vegetation. The project was approved subject to 86 permit conditions, including

conditions to ensure the project does not result in significant adverse environmental effects and conditions for compliance monitoring and enforcement. In 2018, the port authority launched a new enhanced compliance monitoring and enforcement program as part of its Project and Environmental Review process. Project-related information is available at: <https://www.portvancouver.com/development-and-permits/status-of-applications/>.

Western Economic Diversification Canada

The Department of Western Economic Diversification (WD) has employed guidance circulated by the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency to ensure a consistent approach to assessments under sections 67-69 of 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 fiscal year 2018-19, WD did not approve funding for projects undertaken on federal lands (or outside Canada), as defined by CEAA 2012.

Windsor Port Authority

In accordance with Section 71 of CEAA 2012, the Windsor Port Authority (WPA) advises that from April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019, no projects administered by the WPA, that took into account the implementation of mitigation measures as prescribed by expert advisors/consultants, were determined to cause significant adverse environmental effects. Determinations are based on the 2014 guidance issued by the former Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and a review of policies, plans, processes or procedures, roles and responsibilities, audit and feedback and continual improvement mechanisms.