

**Agency Review
of the
Comprehensive Study Report and Related Documents**

AGUATHUNA QUARRY DEVELOPMENT

No	Questions	Rating	Comments
1	Are the necessary documents available for review? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transmittal letter to Minister & Agency • CS report, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • information on involvement of expert FAs • information on public consultations • referenced materials 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transmittal letter is available for review. With respect to information on the involvement of experts this could be found throughout the public registry. • As for information on public consultations see section 5.0 of the CSR report and minutes of public information meeting found in the public registry. • Referenced material has also been made available for review.
2	Has the RA identified the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues arising during the CS & any issues outstanding • conclusions and recommendations regarding the assessment • proposed conditions for approval of the project 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 7 of the Comprehensive Study Report introduces the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, with greater detailed information in Sections 8,9,10 and 11. As it stands there are no outstanding issues, no serious indication of serious or pronounced public concern regarding the potential adverse impacts of the project on the environment or human health and safety has been noted. • Conclusions regarding the assessment can be found in Section 15, pg. 98 of the CSR prepared on behalf of Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. • No proposed conditions for approval are identified in the report.
3	Have other RA's for the project indicated their involvement/concurrence with the CS report? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List other RAs and indicate reasons if they have not signed off on the CS report 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other Responsible Authorities were identified for this report. Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) is the sole RA for the project.
4	List FAs with expertise relevant to the project undergoing CS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Federal Authorities that were contacted and offered expert advice relevant to the project are: the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), Environment Canada, and the Public Works and Government Services of Canada (PWGSC) who assisted ACOA in the management and preparation of the CSR throughout the process.
5	Did the expert FAs make available specialist or expert information or knowledge required by the RA?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, the federal authorities did provide expert advice and/or pertinent knowledge over the course of the CSR. Refer to CSR pg. 4 and also consult the public registry.
6	Did relevant expert FAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advise on issues to be studied • review & comment on the draft report 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expert FA's provided advice on the issues to be studied and they also commented on the draft report.

No	Questions	Rating	Comments
7	Did the review by expert FAs focus on : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scientific/technical data • policy/program issues • regulatory compliance • other aspect (specify) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert FA's focused on a number of issues: DFO provided expert advice on matters concerning fish, fish habitat and fishing. That is the deterioration, destruction or disruption of fish habitat. Environment Canada provided advice on matters pertaining to pollution and migratory birds.
8	Did expert FAs conclude that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS is acceptable (minor or no concerns) • CS is unacceptable (major deficiencies) • must await public comment before deciding • not relevant to FA interests 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Canada: refer to public registry- see letter dated June 24th 1999. The department concluded that the CSR is acceptable given the need for refinement of a mitigation and monitoring strategy through environmental management planning. • DFO: refer to public registry- see letter dated August 11th 1999. The department reviewed the CSR and determined it to be acceptable.
9	Are views of expert FAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided in writing • referenced by the RA only 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With respect to Environment Canada, its views are provided in writing (refer to public registry) • The Department of Fisheries and Oceans
10	List any relevant expert FAs who did not comment on draft CS report and the reasons, if known.		N/A
11	Were all relevant groups and stakeholders consulted during the preparation of the CS? (e.g. provincial and territorial governments, First Nations, local communities) List any key parties not consulted.		Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings were held with local and regional governments. • Stakeholders were contacted to verify if there were any local concerns regarding the project. • A consultation program was also carried out to reach the general public.
12	Was adequate opportunity provided for public and stakeholder input? (e.g. adequate notice, sufficient time for response)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A stakeholders meeting was held in April, later on that year in September, stakeholders were contacted to verify if there were any local public concerns regarding the project. • Interviews were held and a public meeting carried out. However there was no mention of notices that were posted in local newspapers to announce the public meeting or mention of letters being sent directly to interested groups and stakeholders.
13	Were all relevant groups and stakeholders consulted during the preparations of the CS? (List any key parties not consulted) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meetings with stakeholders • local community meetings • open houses • request for written comment only • newspaper and media announcements • other (specify) 		Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with stakeholders. • Consultation activities in the form of private interviews • A public meeting describing the project phases and predicted effects. • A thirty minute presentation of the Draft Copy of the CSR was provided followed by a question and answer period with members of the public. • Graphic displays were also made available. (see Section 5.0)

No	Questions	Rating	Comments
14	What input was requested from the public? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advice on baseline conditions • advice on scoping - issues to be studied • advice on alternatives/mitigation/follow-up • review and document on draft CS report 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public consultation focused mainly on providing information on the project and provided an opportunity to hear the concerns expressed by the public. • The public was not requested to provide advice on baseline conditions, scoping, alternatives, mitigation, follow-up, or to review any of the draft documents.
15	What input was requested from provincial/territorial governments? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advice on baseline conditions • advice on scoping - issues to be studied • advice on alternatives/mitigation/follow-up • review and document on draft CS report 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On January 19, 1998, the project was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Labour for approval under the Newfoundland Environmental Assessment Act. As previously indicated, on March 23, 1998, Aguathuna was advised that no further assessment work was required under the provincial process. • The only other involvement by the province is the need for permits and approvals that the proponent may be required to secure before proceeding with the project. (see Table 1.1 of the CSR)
16	Were concerns raised by the public and stakeholders taken into account in the CS report?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, most of the issues raised during the public comment period had already been incorporated into the Comprehensive Study Report. • Concerns related to the effects of blasting on local residences were raised, and it was agreed that related considerations would be incorporated into the Final CSR.
17	List any problems or limitations relating to public and stakeholder consultations.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
18	Does the CS report clearly define the : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scope of project • scope of assessment 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of the project is defined in Section 6.1 pg. 29 and includes all phases of construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning, including accidental events and malfunctions. • Scope of the assessment is well documented in Section 6.0 of the CSR.
19	Does the CS report include factors required under the Act; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • purpose of the project • alternative means to carry it out • environmental effect of the project and alternative means to carry it out • significance of environmental effects of the project • measures to mitigate significant adverse environmental effects • need for and requirements of a follow-up program • capacity of renewable resources to be significantly affected by the project 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of the project: see Section 1.2 of the CSR • With respect to alternatives to the project, the primary alternative is maintaining the status-quo: see Section 3.2 • Environmental effects of the project are well laid out in Sections 7.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, and 11.0. Alternative means of carrying out the project: see Section 3.1 • Significance of environmental effects of the project are stipulated for each VEC and can be found in Sections 7.10, and 8.0-11.0. • Mitigation measures regarding significant environmental effects are described for each VEC in Sections 8.0-11.0 • Need for and requirements for a follow-up program: see Section 14.2 pg. 95 of the CSR. • Capacity of renewable resources to be significantly affected by the project: see Section 7.3

No	Questions	Rating	Comments
20	Are any other relevant matters considered in the CS pursuant to s.16(1)(e)? (e.g. need for or alternatives to the project) List other matters, if any		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, the need for the project: see Section 1.3 of the CSR.
21	Is information included on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • environmental effects of accidents or malfunctions that may occur in connection with the project • cumulative environmental effects likely to result from the project 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accidents and malfunctions: are also specified for each VEC and are described in Sections 7.5, 8.4, 9.4, and 10.4 • Cumulative effects likely to result from the project are dealt with in Section 13.0
22	Is information included on effects that changes in the environment caused by the project would have on : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • health • socio-economic conditions • physical and cultural heritage • current land and resource use for traditional aboriginal purposes • structures, sites or things of historical, archaeological, paleontological or architectural significance 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health: see Section 12.4 of the CSR • Socio-economic conditions: see Section 12.3 of the CSR • No physical or cultural heritage sites have been identified within the project area. • There are no aboriginal land claims or traditional hunting, gathering or burial grounds on site associated with the site. • There is no mention of structures, sites or things of historical, archaeological significance within the CSR due to the fact that the proposed Aguathuna quarry is located on a former limestone quarry site which dates back to 1913.
23	Is the information listed in question 22 also provided with respect to effects that environmental changes caused by alternative means of carrying out the project would have?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A, since the primary alternative is maintaining the status-quo.
24	Is information included on changes that the environment may cause to : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the project • alternative means of carrying it out 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, environmental hazards that could potentially affect the proposed project include ice scour, erosion and wind induced wave action. See Section 4.8 of the CSR. • The report does not include changes that the environment may cause to the alternative means of carrying it out.
25	Are key terms and concepts in the CS report consistent with CEAA definitions and Agency guidelines? (e.g. scope of project/assessment, environment, environmental effects, mitigation, alternative means, significance, follow-up)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes
26	Is the project clearly described and illustrated with plans, charts, diagrams, and maps?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, see Sections 1 and 2 of the CSR, also refer to public registry where there are site photos and maps of the site.
27	Is there a description of the project site and any off-site areas which may be affected? (e.g. by pollutants, traffic)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Section 2.2 (Description of Existing site) and Section 4.0 (Existing Environment) of the CSR
28	Is it clear why geographical and temporal boundaries for the project were selected?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, it is clear why the geographical and spatial boundaries for the project were selected. In fact these boundaries differ for each VEC and are described in Section 6.5 pg. 31 of the CSR.
29	Are baseline environmental conditions described? (e.g. in terms of current conditions and conditions expected if the project proceeds)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, see Section 4.0 - Existing Environment, which provides baseline information on the current conditions.

No	Questions	Rating	Comments
30	Is there a description of : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sensitive/valued components of the existing environment • methods used in their identification 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the sensitive/valued components of the environment and how they were identified are found in Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4.
31	Does the report identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing data sources consulted • field surveys and studies conducted • policies/plans influencing regional development • designated areas • views of interested parties • gaps or uncertainty in the information available 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes
32	List the main environmental effects considered in the CS report. (Annex i should be completed for each of these effects)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Habitat and Fish, Freshwater Resources, Terrestrial Resources and Air Quality.
33	Have any environmental effects important to a decision concerning the need for further assessment of the project been omitted?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
34	Is the project expected to have effects which are not considered in the CS report?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
35	Is an explanation provided if any expected effects are not considered?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
36	Are the conclusions of the CS report consistent with findings of the CS?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes
37	Is the CS report clear, well-organized, succinct, and objective (unbiased)?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes
38	Is a non-technical summary of key information included in the CS report?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A non-technical summary of key information is included in the CS report: see Section 15.0
39	Conclusions of CS report review		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CS report covers all the factors required by the Act. Taking into account the proposed mitigation, the scope of the work proposed, the conditions at the site, and the existing knowledge of environmental conditions of project-environment interactions the Aguathuna Quarry development is not likely to cause any significant adverse residual environmental effects, including cumulative effects.

**ANNEX I
AGUATHUNA SEASONAL ROAD
NEWFOUNDLAND**

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Marine Habitat and Fish			
No	Questions	Rating	Comments
1	Is the effect clearly described in relation to the project phases?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see sections 8.2.1 (construction), 8.2.2 (operation) and 8.2.3 (decommissioning) of the comprehensive study report.
2	Are methods used to scope the effect and the rationale for their use identified?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, a thorough review has been conducted, see Section 6.5.1 of the CSR.
3	Is the expected magnitude of the effect described? (e.g. in measurable quantities where possible or accompanied by definitions if qualitative descriptions are used)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The magnitude of the effect is described in the following manner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - geographical extent - duration of interaction - frequency of occurrence - insignificant or significant See section 8.1 and Table 8.5 for a definition of these terms.
4	Are methods and data used to predict the magnitude of the effect identified?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 8.2 of CSR. Shows information pertaining to interactions and predicted effects for each phase.
5	Are gaps or limitations in the knowledge-base identified?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no identifiable gaps or limitations in the knowledge base with respect to marine habitat and fish
6	Is the significance of the predicted effect distinguished from its magnitude?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, for significance criteria, see section 8.1. For magnitude see table 8.5
7	Is the predicted effect described in objective and reasonable terms? (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible, consistent with or)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 8.2
8	Is it clear how the significance of the effect was determined?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 8.1
9	Are contrary opinions about the significance acknowledged?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments were received questioning the significance of the marine habitat and fish.
10	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project is the «no action» alternative considered?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The no action alternative is considered but is not a preferred alternative. See section 3.2 of CSR.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Marine Habitat and Fish			
11	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project, are predicted effects of the project and «alternative to» the project compared?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
12	Are alternatives to the project rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the primary alternative being the status-quo no compelling environmental reasons for maintaining the status-quo were found. Other reasons for rejection are based on economical and technical feasibility.
13	Are predicted effects of the project compared to effects of alternative means of carrying it out?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
14	Are the alternative means rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternative means of carrying out the project were evaluated on their technical and economical feasibility.
15	Is mitigation proposed for all significant adverse effects of the project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see Section 8.6 of the CSR
16	Is evidence provided indicating that the proposed mitigation would be effective?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCME Canadian Water Quality Guidelines and the CCME Interim Marine and Estuarine Water Quality Guidelines will be adhered to.
17	Have the proponent and / or RA made clear commitments to implement the referenced mitigation if approval for the project is granted?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
18	Are residual adverse effects expected that would not be avoided through mitigation?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, residual environmental effects are expected to be non-significant.
19	If so, are the residual effects expected to be significant? (list any such effects)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
20	Have expert FAs and the public consulted about the predicted effects and residual effects of the projects?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the consultations with expert federal authorities are not available in the CS report but are available in the public registry. The public, according to the information in the CS report had been consulted on the predicted and residual effects. (Section 5.0)
21	Are they in agreement with the CS findings concerning these effects? (Note outstanding issues below)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown
22	Describe any issues outstanding with respect to environmental effects of the project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Freshwater Resources			
No	Questions	Rating	Comments

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Freshwater Resources		
1	Is the effect clearly described in relation to the project phases?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see sections 9.2.1 (construction), 9.2.2 (operation) and 9.2.3 (decommissioning) of the comprehensive study report.
2	Are methods used to scope the effect and the rationale for their use identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, a thorough review has been conducted, see Section 6.5.2 of the CSR.
3	Is the expected magnitude of the effect described? (e.g. in measurable quantities where possible or accompanied by definitions if qualitative descriptions are used)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The magnitude of the effect is described in the following manner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - geographical extent - duration of interaction - frequency of occurrence - insignificant or significant <p>See section 9.1 and Table 9.5 for a definition of these terms.</p>
4	Are methods and data used to predict the magnitude of the effect identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 9.2 of CSR. Shows information pertaining to interactions and predicted effects for each phase.
5	Are gaps or limitations in the knowledge-base identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no identifiable gaps or limitations in the knowledge base with respect to freshwater resources
6	Is the significance of the predicted effect distinguished from its magnitude?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, for significance criteria, see section 9.1. For magnitude see table 9.5
7	Is the predicted effect described in objective and reasonable terms? (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible, consistent with or)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 9.2
8	Is it clear how the significance of the effect was determined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 9.1
9	Are contrary opinions about the significance acknowledged?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments were received questioning the significance of the freshwater resources.
10	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project is the «no action» alternative considered?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The no action alternative is considered but is not a preferred alternative. See section 3.2 of CSR.
11	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project, are predicted effects of the project and «alternative to» the project compared?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
12	Are alternatives to the project rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the primary alternative being the status-quo no compelling environmental reasons for maintaining the status-quo were found. Other reasons for rejection are based on economical and technical feasibility.
13	Are predicted effects of the project compared to effects of alternative means of carrying it out?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Freshwater Resources			
14	Are the alternative means rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternative means of carrying out the project were evaluated on their technical and economical feasibility.
15	Is mitigation proposed for all significant adverse effects of the project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see Section 9.6 of the CSR
16	Is evidence provided indicating that the proposed mitigation would be effective?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Guidelines for Protection of Freshwater Fish Habitat in Newfoundland and Labrador by Fisheries and Oceans Canada are strictly followed.
17	Have the proponent and / or RA made clear commitments to implement the referenced mitigation if approval for the project is granted?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
18	Are residual adverse effects expected that would not be avoided through mitigation?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, residual environmental effects are expected to be non-significant.
19	If so, are the residual effects expected to be significant? (list any such effects)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
20	Have expert FAs and the public consulted about the predicted effects and residual effects of the projects?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the consultations with expert federal authorities are not available in the CS report but are available in the public registry. The public, according to the information in the CS report had been consulted on the predicted and residual effects. (Section 5.0)
21	Are they in agreement with the CS findings concerning these effects? (Note outstanding issues below)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown
22	Describe any issues outstanding with respect to environmental effects of the project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Terrestrial Resources			
No	Questions	Rating	Comments
1	Is the effect clearly described in relation to the project phases?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see sections 10.2.1 (construction), 10.2.2 (operation) and 10.2.3 (decommissioning) of the comprehensive study report.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Terrestrial Resources			
2	Are methods used to scope the effect and the rationale for their use identified?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, a thorough review has been conducted, see Section 6.5.3 of the CSR.
3	Is the expected magnitude of the effect described? (e.g. in measurable quantities where possible or accompanied by definitions if qualitative descriptions are used)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The magnitude of the effect is described in the following manner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - geographical extent - duration of interaction - frequency of occurrence - insignificant or significant <p>See section 10.1 and Table 10.5 for a definition of these terms.</p>
4	Are methods and data used to predict the magnitude of the effect identified?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 10.2 of CSR. Shows information pertaining to interactions and predicted effects for each phase.
5	Are gaps or limitations in the knowledge-base identified?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no identifiable gaps or limitations in the knowledge base with respect to marine habitat and fish
6	Is the significance of the predicted effect distinguished from its magnitude?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, for significance criteria, see section 10.1. For magnitude see table 10.5
7	Is the predicted effect described in objective and reasonable terms? (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible, consistent with or)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 10.2
8	Is it clear how the significance of the effect was determined?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 10.1
9	Are contrary opinions about the significance acknowledged?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments were received questioning the significance of the terrestrial resources.
10	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project is the «no action» alternative considered?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The no action alternative is considered but is not a preferred alternative . See section 3.2 of CSR.
11	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project, are predicted effects of the project and «alternative to» the project compared?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
12	Are alternatives to the project rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the primary alternative being the status-quo no compelling environmental reasons for maintaining the status-quo were found. Other reasons for rejection are based on economical and technical feasibility.
13	Are predicted effects of the project compared to effects of alternative means of carrying it out?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
14	Are the alternative means rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternative means of carrying out the project were evaluated on their technical and economical feasibility.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Terrestrial Resources			
15	Is mitigation proposed for all significant adverse effects of the project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see Section 10.6 of the CSR
16	Is evidence provided indicating that the proposed mitigation would be effective?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Migratory Bird Convention Act and Regulations will be adhered to.
17	Have the proponent and / or RA made clear commitments to implement the referenced mitigation if approval for the project is granted?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
18	Are residual adverse effects expected that would not be avoided through mitigation?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, residual environmental effects are expected to be non-significant.
19	If so, are the residual effects expected to be significant? (list any such effects)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
20	Have expert FAs and the public consulted about the predicted effects and residual effects of the projects?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the consultations with expert federal authorities are not available in the CS report but are available in the public registry. The public, according to the information in the CS report had been consulted on the predicted and residual effects. (Section 5.0)
21	Are they in agreement with the CS findings concerning these effects? (Note outstanding issues below)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown
22	Describe any issues outstanding with respect to environmental effects of the project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Air Quality			
No	Questions	Rating	Comments
1	Is the effect clearly described in relation to the project phases?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see sections 11.2 and table 11.4 of the comprehensive study report.
2	Are methods used to scope the effect and the rationale for their use identified?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, a thorough review has been conducted, see Section 6.5.4 of the CSR.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Air Quality		
3	Is the expected magnitude of the effect described? (e.g. in measurable quantities where possible or accompanied by definitions if qualitative descriptions are used)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The magnitude of the effect is described in the following manner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - geographical extent - duration of interaction - frequency of occurrence - insignificant or significant <p>See section 11.1 and Table 11.4 for a definition of these terms.</p>
4	Are methods and data used to predict the magnitude of the effect identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see sections 11.2 and 11.3 of CSR. shows information pertaining to interactions and predicted effects for each phase.
5	Are gaps or limitations in the knowledge-base identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no identifiable gaps or limitations in the knowledge base with respect to air quality
6	Is the significance of the predicted effect distinguished from its magnitude?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, for significance criteria, see section 11.1. For magnitude see table 11.4
7	Is the predicted effect described in objective and reasonable terms? (e.g. beneficial or adverse, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible, consistent with or)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 11.2
8	Is it clear how the significance of the effect was determined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see section 11.1
9	Are contrary opinions about the significance acknowledged?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments were received questioning the significance of the air quality.
10	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project is the «no action» alternative considered?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The no action alternative is considered but is not a preferred alternative. See section 3.2 of CSR.
11	If the scope of the assessment includes alternatives to the project, are predicted effects of the project and «alternative to» the project compared?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
12	Are alternatives to the project rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the primary alternative being the status-quo no compelling environmental reasons for maintaining the status-quo were found. Other reasons for rejection are based on economical and technical feasibility.
13	Are predicted effects of the project compared to effects of alternative means of carrying it out?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
14	Are the alternative means rejected because the predicted effects are greater? (note any other reasons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternative means of carrying out the project were evaluated on their technical and economical feasibility.
15	Is mitigation proposed for all significant adverse effects of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, see Section 11.5 of the CSR

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT: Air Quality			
16	Is evidence provided indicating that the proposed mitigation would be effective?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definitions for the rating of effect significance on air quality have been developed from the Federal Ambient Air Quality Objectives and the Provincial Air Quality Regulations of Newfoundland.
17	Have the proponent and / or RA made clear commitments to implement the referenced mitigation if approval for the project is granted?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
18	Are residual adverse effects expected that would not be avoided through mitigation?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No, residual environmental effects are expected to be non-significant.
19	If so, are the residual effects expected to be significant? (list any such effects)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
20	Have expert FAs and the public consulted about the predicted effects and residual effects of the projects?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the consultations with expert federal authorities are not available in the CS report but are available in the public registry. The public, according to the information in the CS report had been consulted on the predicted and residual effects. (Section 5.0)
21	Are they in agreement with the CS findings concerning these effects? (Note outstanding issues below)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown
22	Describe any issues outstanding with respect to environmental effects of the project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A