

## Sadaka, Jennifer -JLT

---

**From:** Jeffrey, Barry [Dartmouth]  
**Sent:** June 1, 2007 3:17 PM  
**To:** Troke, Glenn [St. John's]  
**Cc:** Blair, Kevin [Dartmouth]; Power, Kevin [St. John's]; Goulet, Jeanette [St. John's]; Davidson, Kevin [Sackville]; Hogan, Holly [St. John's]; Standing, Lorraine [NCR]  
**Subject:** RE: Belleoram - Comp Study Scope  
**Attachments:** Revised VEC Table.doc

Greetings,

I would have thought that the train had already left station with a fully scoped project on federal side ([http://www.acee-ceaa.gc.ca/050/viewer\\_e.cfm?cear\\_id=19881](http://www.acee-ceaa.gc.ca/050/viewer_e.cfm?cear_id=19881)). In my view, narrowing the scope at this late stage in process does not necessarily follow from the rationale described by TC

Interim scoping deals with those scenarios in which specific law list triggers administered by NRCAN, DFO, EC and TC are the only federal EA triggers in relation to a major project proposal ([http://www.acee-ceaa.gc.ca/012/016/index\\_e.htm](http://www.acee-ceaa.gc.ca/012/016/index_e.htm))

In this case, with ACOA and a funding trigger in the equation, interim scoping does not apply. And I can't see how it can be applied retroactively anyway. As it stands, the federal-provincial panel of the whole of the Whites Point quarry and marine terminal chugs along based on only TC and DFO law list triggers for the marine works and a Minister's decision on referral of whole project.

And since the Minister has already made a decision on the track report as submitted for Belleoram project (i.e., a project which included both the quarry and terminal), has the CEA Agency offered anything on this proposed approach to narrowing the scope at this point? I can contact regional Agency office at least. It would seem that the implications extend well beyond explaining the scoping changes to the public during a review of a revised CSR (as proposed below). And of course, the more limited provincial EA review is long over

Lorraine, are you aware of any similar scenarios in country? (We are an expert FA here).

Look forward to seeing how this gets interpreted.

Barry

---

**From:** Troke, Glenn [St. John's]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 01, 2007 3:29 PM  
**To:** Jeffrey, Barry [Dartmouth]; Power, Kevin [St. John's]  
**Subject:** FW: Belleoram - Comp Study Scope

FYI and opinion.

---

**From:** Goulet, Jeanette [St. John's]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 01, 2007 1:55 PM  
**To:** Troke, Glenn [St. John's]  
**Subject:** RE: Belleoram - Comp Study Scope

Glenn, will this have any implications for interim scoping?

---

**From:** Decker, Randy [<mailto:DECKERR@tc.gc.ca>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 31, 2007 1:40 PM  
**To:** Rodrigues, Vanessa [CEAA]; Barnes, Marvin: F&O; Powell, Shawna: F&O; Power, Randy G: F&O; Whyte, Margie; Kean, Shawn: PWGSC; David, Jacinthe: HC; McAllister, Andrew: NRCAN; Clements, Deborah: HC; Troke, Glenn [St. John's]; Goulet, Jeanette [St. John's]; Hogan, Holly [St. John's]; Tee, Karl: ACOA  
**Subject:** Belleoram - Comp Study Scope

Good Afternoon All,

Yesterday, May 30, 2007, ACOA received a funding application for the proposed Rock Quarry and Marine Terminal near Belleoram, NL from Continental Stone Limited (the proponent). The funding application specified that funds were requested for the marine terminal portion of the project only therefore ACOA will be limiting their scope of project to the marine terminal only using the "In-Until-Out" Approach.

Up to this point ACOA's involvement in the environmental assessment process has been based on indications that the proponent would eventually apply for funding for aspects of the project. Given that ACOA has now received a funding application and that application specifies funding for the marine terminal only, the three RAs (DFO, TC, and ACOA) will now have the same scope of project for this development proposal and the CSR will be limited to the marine terminal component of the project.

This change in the scope of project will be clearly explained within the draft CSR and will be presented to the public during the second round of public consultation. The quarry development and operation will not be assessed during the CEAA assessment unless there is another federal department triggered as a RA on the quarry site.

The provincial Department of Natural Resources is currently conducting its quarry permitting process which requires the proponent to submit Development, Operation, and Decommissioning/Closure Plans to the province for review and approval. In addition, an Environmental Protection Plan and a Spill Contingency Plan have already been submitted to the province for review and approval.

Attached please find a revised VEC table from the Track Report which was submitted to the Minister of the Environment in December 2006. The VEC Table has been revised to reflect the narrower scope (marine terminal only). Please review the revised VEC table and feel free to provide comments.



Revised VEC  
Table.doc (42 KB)

I will go through all the comments and highlight those that are related to the marine terminal. If your departmental comments on the draft CSR were related to the marine terminal portion please feel free to send to me again to ensure that they are addressed in the redraft of the CSR. I would appreciate if you could get those comments to me by next Friday, June 7, 2007.

Thanks,

**Randy Decker**

Environmental Officer | Agent de l'environnement

Transport Canada | Transports Canada

P.O. Box 1300 | C.P. 1300

St. John's, NL A1C 6H8

Tel: (709) 772-3061

Fax: (709) 772-3072

Cell: (709) 727-2444

e-mail: deckerr@tc.gc.ca