



**Mackenzie Valley**  
Environmental Impact Review Board

DRAFT

# Terms of Reference and Work Plan

for the Environmental Assessment of  
the Paramount Cameron Hills Extension

**Issued: June 30, 2003**

**Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board**

200 Scotia Centre

P.O. Box 938

Yellowknife, NT

X1A 2N7

Tel: (867) 766-7052

Fax: (867) 766-7074

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
1 Introduction .....	3
1.1 Purpose of this Document.....	3
1.2 Referral to Environmental Assessment.....	3
1.3 Legal Context.....	3
2 Scope of Development.....	4
3 Scope of Assessment .....	7
4 Terms of Reference .....	8
4.1 General Items.....	8
4.2 Specific Items.....	10
5 Assessment Process.....	13
5.1 Responsibilities .....	13
Review Board.....	13
Government Bodies .....	14
Developer .....	14
Other Parties.....	14
5.2 Milestones.....	14
5.3 Deliverables .....	15
5.3 Schedule.....	17

# **1 Introduction**

## ***1.1 Purpose of this Document***

This document outlines the process of the Environmental Assessment for the proposed extension of Paramount Resources Ltd.'s Cameron Hills operation in the Northwest Territories. Section 2 defines the scope of the development that is being assessed. Section 3 defines the scope of the assessment, i.e. the issues that will be addressed in this assessment. Section 4 provides the developer with terms of reference for the Developer's Assessment Report (DAR). Finally, section 5 defines the responsibilities of those involved in the assessment and provides an overview of the process and a schedule.

## ***1.2 Referral to Environmental Assessment***

Paramount Resources Ltd applied to the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB) for an amendment to Land Use Permit MV2002A0046 and Water Licence MV2002L1-0007 in April 2003. Paramount proposed 5 wells and 22 km of pipeline in addition to the development already existing, or already permitted to be carried out. The MVLWB carried out a Preliminary Screening of the proposed development according to Section 124 of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act (MVRMA). As per Section 124(3), the MVLWB acted as lead screener. The MVLWB consulted 22 organizations during the Preliminary Screening Process.

On May 28, 2003 the MVLWB referred the proposed development to Environmental Assessment, according to Section 125 of the MVRMA, citing concern over possible cumulative impacts and a potential for public concern. The Preliminary Screening Report concluded that the environmental impacts from the 5 wells and 22 km pipeline can be mitigated with known technology. The MVEIRB notified the developer on May 29, 2003 that the Environmental Assessment had been started.

## ***1.3 Legal Context***

This Environmental Assessment is subject to the requirements of Part 5 of the MVRMA. It is also subject to the MVEIRB's Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines (revised in April 2001) and the MVEIRB's Rules of Procedure. These documents can be accessed on the MVEIRB's web site ([www.mveirb.nt.ca](http://www.mveirb.nt.ca)). (Please contact the MVEIRB for further information).

## 2 Scope of Development

In scoping this development, the Review Board is aware of the benefits of considering reasonably foreseeable future developments in cumulative effects assessment. Although less detail is typically available for future developments, good cumulative effects assessment demands their consideration, based on best reasonable estimates. This has been considered in scoping this development.

The scope of the development for this Environmental Assessment includes all reasonably foreseeable activities by Paramount Resources to extract oil and gas from the Cameron Hills Significant Discovery Licence Area (see map 1). According to the Development Description submitted by Paramount (Public Registry Item #7) the following overall time plan is anticipated:

- 2003/04 Drill, tie-in and produce 5 wells. Potentially acquire additional seismic already approved.
- 2003/04 Drill, tie-in and produce up to 3 additional wells not yet applied for.
- 2004/13 On an annual basis, drill, tie-in and produce approximately 3 to 8 wells each year to an approximate total additional maximum of 50 wells (not including the 5 wells planned in 2003/04 under existing permits) – always dependent on prior years drilling success and economics. Acquire the balance of the approved 533-kilometer 3D program and potentially acquire an additional 200 kilometers of 3D.

The drilling of new wells involves the following principal tasks:

- Where access does not yet exist, an access route will be cleared and an ice road constructed.
- One or more drilling rigs will be moved on location and set up.
- The well will be drilled.
- The drilling equipment will be moved out or moved to another well site.
- A service rig will be moved in.
- The well will be completed.
- The service rig will be moved out or to another well site.
- The well will be flow tested to determine its economics by evaluating reservoir parameters including permeability, need for, or effectiveness of wellbore stimulation, well deliverability, potential reservoir size.

If a well proves to be economically viable it will be tied into the gathering system, which involves:

- A right-of-way will be cleared for flow lines (if required)
- Oil, gas and water gathering & injection systems and well site facilities will be constructed and operated at each of the selected wells.
- Modification of the existing central battery located in H-03 117° 30', 60° 10' (already permitted)

- A water disposal pipeline will be constructed.
- A fuel gas pipeline distribution system and/or electrical distribution system will be constructed to the oil well.
- Test satellite facilities (location to be determined based on future drilling) which includes a test separator, flare knockout drum, flare stack, chemical tanks and pumps, and antenna will be constructed

Above activities require the following additional developments:

- Re-use a temporary winter access road, approximately 33 km in length from Indian Cabins, Alberta on Highway 35, to a point approximately 10 km into the NWT.
- Air access will be via helicopter and fixed wing, likely to sites already permitted.
- Construction of ice bridges as required.
- Temporary 20 to 50 man camps for drilling and 100 to 200 person camps for pipeline construction and well tie in. The camp locations will take advantage of previous camp or airstrip locations already permitted. Potable water source for the camps may come from existing potable wells or new wells will be drilled at each camp location.
- Withdrawal of drilling water from a lake near the well site and, if required, from the shallow water source wells.
- Disposal of drill waste in remote sumps. Some clearing and leveling will be required around the sumps.
- Use of borrow pits as required. Soil excavated from the borrow pit will be used during the closure of the drilling fluid and sewage sumps using the mix/bury/cover method.
- During production operations access to the wells via all-terrain vehicles (ATV) in summer and regular vehicles and/or snowmobiles in winter.
- Installation of ATV bridges potentially with flowlines suspended from them.
- Other undertakings in support of or in conjunction with the principle developments or accessory developments and activities.

In any given year the following timetable for activities will apply:

*Seismic* This is not projected to be an annual activity. Leading with reconnaissance 2D seismic where practical, the balance of the approved 533-kilometer 3D and approximately 200 kilometers of an additional 3D could be acquired over the next 5 years.

The timeline of seismic field activity is dependent on the amount to be acquired and the availability of a primary contractor. Assuming the projected 200 kilometer 3D program were to be acquired in one season, the developer anticipates the field activity would commence approximately mid January with recording completed by the end of February.

*Drilling* To drill, complete and evaluate 3 to 8 wells, road and wellsite construction would occur one well after the other and the rigs would move from one

well to the next. Usually one drilling rig would drill three or four wells. Therefore, if 8 wells were planned, 2 or 3 drilling rigs would be required.

- Freeze up anticipated to be complete by Dec 1
- Open Alberta and NWT access routes into area – Dec 2 - Dec 17
- Construct first new wellsite - Dec 18 – 23
- Move in drilling rig and drill well – Jan 2 - Jan 17
- Move out drilling rig, move in service rig, complete and test well Jan 18 - Feb 2
- This process would be repeated with up to three drilling rigs and commence from one well to the next as required.
- All rig activity would be completed approximately mid March.

This process would be repeated with up to three drilling rigs and commence from one well to the next as required.

*Service rigs* Assuming one service rig can likely service four wells per winter, if there are eight new wells per year (the maximum predicted), there would be two service rigs required. They would start up in early January and finish the end of March.

*Pipeline* Tying-in successful wells commences once the well has been drilled and evaluated to ensure pipe is required. On an annual basis, it is anticipated starting mid January and finishing first week in April. This is dependent on number of wells to tie-in.

*Production* Two production operators are in the Cameron Hills field at all times, checking wells and maintaining production all year. This is not anticipated to change.

### 3 Scope of Assessment

The scope of this Assessment includes all activities, and their direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, within the Cameron Hills Significant Discovery Licence Area (SDLA) (see map 1). That is, within all Significant Discovery Licences and all Production Licences held by Paramount Resources, or one of its partners, in the Cameron Hills, NWT area. While there may be potential for further oil and gas development outside the SDLA, these developments and their impacts cannot be reasonably foreseen at this point.

Paramount Resources' Cameron Hills Project has undergone two Environmental Assessments under the MVRMA in the past. The first, *EA00-004 Paramount Cameron Hills Drilling Project*<sup>1</sup>, examined the drilling and testing of 9 wells proposed by Paramount in 2000, but excluded another 10 wells Paramount then anticipated drilling over a number of years at unknown locations in the area. The second, *EA01-005 Paramount Cameron Hills Gathering System and Pipeline*<sup>2</sup>, examined an additional 8 wells, a central battery, and approximately 75 km of pipeline, as well as other components of the gathering system. Both Environmental Assessments concluded that the proposed developments were not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects or public concern, provided a number of recommendations issued by the Review Board were followed.

Therefore, the Review Board has already established that the individual components of the development under assessment (i.e. drilling, testing and tie in of oil and gas wells) generally are not likely to have a significant adverse effect, if considered in isolation. This Environmental Assessment will focus on the cumulative effects of drilling, testing and tie-in of up to 8 wells per year over a period of 10 years, production of oil and gas over 15 to 20 years, and abandonment and reclamation of the entire development. The effects of individual components are included in the scope where areas or locations may be especially sensitive to disturbance and where the effects have not previously been assessed for these areas or locations.

Throughout this Environmental Assessment, the Review Board defines cumulative effects as the effects of the proposed development in combination with effects from other past, present or reasonably foreseeable developments.

---

1 MVEIRB (2001): Report of Environmental Assessment On the Paramount Resources Ltd. Cameron Hills Drilling Project. October 16, 2001.

2 MVEIRB (2002): Report of Environmental Assessment On the Paramount Resources Ltd. Cameron Hills Gathering System and Pipeline Development. December 3, 2001.

## 4 Terms of Reference

Paramount is to provide the Review Board with a Developer's Assessment Report (DAR) that addresses all items specified in this section.

### 4.1 General Items

#### Spatial Boundaries

The spatial boundaries for this assessment should be set according to the ecosystem component being assessed, rather than using a common study area. The study area for impacts on water quality, for instance, may be limited to those watersheds or sub-watersheds in which the development takes places. The study area for air quality, on the other hand, will likely encompass a larger area and will be based on prevailing wind conditions rather than physical features in the landscape. Similarly, the study area for assessing impacts of spills or malfunctions may be rather narrow along water ways but extend downstream well beyond the SDLA. A rationale for each spatial boundary chosen is to be provided.

#### Baseline / Temporal Boundaries

Because the main purpose of this Environmental Assessment is to examine cumulative effects of oil and gas development in the Cameron Hills area, the baseline for measuring impacts against should be set as close to pre-development conditions as feasible. The earliest point for which Paramount can be reasonably expected to provide any baseline data is immediately prior to the time Paramount commenced activities. This means the DAR for this assessment should use the same baseline and the same starting point as the DAR for *EA00-004 Paramount Cameron Hills Drilling Project*. All impacts and environmental degradation should be measured against the conditions prevailing before Paramount started its activities at Cameron Hills.

The temporal boundaries for this assessment should be set according to the potential impacts rather than the duration of the development. In assessing water quality, for instance, the DAR should take into account that certain development components, such as sumps may be left in place and may pose a threat to ground water quality long after all activities have ceased. The development schedule may change over time (e.g. there may be no wells drilled for several years or the proposed seismic may be acquired at a later date than proposed). The DAR should assume that all proposed components will at some point be developed, regardless of when they may be developed.

#### Impact Prediction

Paramount is expected to generally characterize each impact in terms of:



- direction (beneficial / adverse);
- geographical extent (spatial boundaries);
- frequency;
- reversibility;
- magnitude;
- duration;
- probability;
- significance.

For each impact prediction or proposed mitigation, all uncertainties (e.g. due to poor baseline data or low predictive validity) should be stated explicitly. It will be up to the Review Board to ultimately determine whether or not an impact is significant. The developer should present its views on the significance of each impact, in terms of the criteria listed above.

Following the focus of this assessment on cumulative effects, Paramount is expected to examine effects on ecosystem components from all development activities combined. Paramount will analyze and report on the cumulative impacts that might result from the development impacts in combination with those of other past, present or reasonably foreseeable developments or activities. It will:

- a) Identify the valued components that may be affected by the proposed development in combination with other human activities.
- b) Identify the other past, present and reasonably foreseeable human activities and developments that may affect the same valued components.
- c) Predict the combined impact of the proposed development in combination with the past, present and reasonably foreseeable future activities and developments (b) on the valued components identified (a).
- d) Describe ways to avoid, mitigate or manage those impacts.

Different kinds of cumulative impacts that may be considered include:

- incremental (additive) effects resulting from repeated additions of a similar nature;
- interactive processes that combine to cause an effect;
- sequential effects where one reversible impact is followed by another, e.g. disturbance from drilling related traffic followed by pipeline construction related traffic;
- complex causation where one impact may trigger changes in the environment that in turn impact other ecosystem components;
- synergistic impacts where impacts on different ecosystem components combine to cause an overall degradation of the environment;
- trigger effects resulting when a threshold is passed.

## 4.2 Specific Items

Because it has already been established that individual development components are not likely to have a significant adverse impact, the DAR should not present development components and their impacts. Rather the DAR should examine ecosystem components and analyze how they will be impacted by all development components combined in space and over time, taking into account section 4.1.

### A Summary

- A-1 *Non Technical Summary:* Please provide a plain-language, non-technical summary of the EA Report to enable the public to follow the proceedings.
- A-2 *Executive Summary:* Please provide an executive summary of the EA Report, containing the most relevant points for decision-makers.
- A-3 *Conformity Table:* The DAR should include a table cross referencing the items in these Terms of Reference with relevant sections of the DAR.

If requested by the Review Board, the developer will have the summaries translated into the appropriate Aboriginal language(s).

### B Developer Information

- B-1 *Company Corporate History:* Please summarize the company's corporate history in Canada and the Northwest Territories. Also include the corporate histories of any partners.
- B-2 *Proposed Development Ownership:* List all owners of the proposed developments and the portion each will own.
- B-3 *Organizational Structure:* Identify the current corporate and individual responsibilities for the proposed development and associated operations.
- B-4 *Performance Record:* Provide a record, preferably in form of a concordance table showing how and to what extent the Review Board's recommendations and suggestions from EA00-004 and EA01-005 have been implemented.

### C Development Description

The Board requires a complete development description.

- C-1 *Timing:* Provide the proposed long term schedule as well as generic seasonal schedules for the project, and identify any time constraints.
- C-3 *Construction Methods:* Describe the methods used to build access roads, well pads, pipelines, and any other components.
- C-4 *Operations:* Describe the operations in terms of normal activities and in terms of potential malfunctions and accidents.
- C-5 *Waste Management:* Give a description of your existing and proposed waste management plans.

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the Review Board will make a final determination of significance, the developer should submit its views on significance for each impact.

- C-6 *Water Use*: Provide a water budget for access and lease construction as well as drilling operations. Identify potential water sources.
- C-7 *Abandonment and Restoration*: Describe your plans for abandonment and restoration, including the well sites, sumps, and access roads, battery sites, etc.. Include any plans for long term monitoring.
- C-8 *Other*: Include any other relevant proposed activities or development components.

## **D Effects of the Environment**

This section pertains to potential changes to the development (e.g. changes to timing or alternative methods), caused by the environment (e.g. through extreme weather conditions, flooding, etc...).

- D-1 *Description of Effects*: List and describe all effects that the environment may have on your development (e.g. global warming).
- D-2 *Changes to Development*: List and describe any changes or modifications to your proposed development that may be caused by the environment.

## **E Regulatory Regime:**

- E-1 *Current Components* Provide a table summarizing relevant licences, permits or other authorizations required for the proposed development.
- E-2 *Future Components*: Provide a table summarizing relevant licences, permits or other authorizations you anticipate to require for the proposed development components.

## **F Public Consultation:**

- G-1 *Records*: Provide minutes and a summary of consultation undertaken with the public, Aboriginal organizations, land owners, federal, territorial and municipal governments, and others. Include dates and participants.
- G-2 *Issues*: Identify the issues raised, how they were resolved and what issues remain unresolved.

## **G Effects on the Environment**

For each of the ecosystem components listed below provide the following:

- baseline information prior to startup of Paramount's activities;
- current conditions;
- spatial and temporal boundaries with rational; and
- impact predictions according to section 4.1 including potential malfunctions.

- G-1 *Air*
- G-2 *Terrain*, including permafrost
- G-3 *Soil*
- G-4 *Water*, including surface and ground water, quantity and quality
- G-5 *Wildlife (including birds)*
- G-6 *Fish*

G-7 *Vegetation*

G-8 *Cultural and heritage resources*

G-9 *Traditional Harvesting*

G-10 *Other social and economic factors*

G-11 *Aesthetics*

## **H Alternatives**

The DAR should discuss alternatives to the currently proposed development components, their environmental impacts, and their limitations. As a minimum the following alternatives should be considered:

- alternative waste management, such as sumpleless drilling systems;
- directional drilling methods;
- alternative transport modes; and
- alternative scheduling, e.g. stretching the program over a longer period of time;

## **J Monitoring, Evaluation and Adaptive Management**

Where the DAR identifies an impact and a mitigation measure it should also discuss how this will be monitored, if necessary, and how management practices may be adapted over time to ensure the long term effectiveness of mitigation measures.

## 5 Assessment Process

### 5.1 Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities of the Review Board and its staff, government bodies, the developer and other parties in the EA are explained in this section. Further information regarding the structure of the EA process is available in the Review Board's Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines and the Rules of Procedure. Both documents are available from the Review Board.

All submissions received from all sources will be considered during the Review Board's decision-making processes on the environmental assessment. Usually these submissions will be public documents and will be posted on the Public Registry. However, the Review Board can and will accept documents on a confidential basis if required. Submissions should be in a format that is easily available to all stakeholders and should follow any templates provided by the Review Board.

#### **Review Board**

The Review Board, assisted by its staff, is required to undertake the following in relation to this EA:

- conduct the EA in accordance with ss.126(1) of the *MVRMA*;
- take into account any previous screening or assessment report made in relation to the development, in accordance with s.127 of the *MVRMA*;
- determine the scope of the development, in accordance with ss.117(1) of the *MVRMA*;
- consider environmental assessment factors, in accordance with ss.117(2) of the *MVRMA*;
- make a determination regarding the environmental impacts and public concern of the development, in accordance with ss.128(1) of the *MVRMA*;
- identify areas and extent of impacts within or outside the Mackenzie Valley in which the development is likely to have a significant adverse impact or be a cause of significant public concern, in accordance with ss.128(4) of the *MVRMA*;
- report to the designated regulatory agency (the NEB) in accordance with ss.128(2) of the *MVRMA*; and
- report to the Federal Minister in accordance with ss.128(2) of the *MVRMA*.

The Review Board's Environmental Assessment Officer (EAO) is the primary point of contact between the Review Board and the developer, government bodies (federal, territorial and municipal), non-government organizations (NGOs), First Nations, expert advisors (expert consultants contracted directly by the Review Board), the public and other interested parties. This does not limit or preclude the developer's contact with other parties during the EA process.

This Environmental Assessment will be coordinated and facilitated by Martin Haefele.

## **Government Bodies**

Government bodies may be involved in the EA process as:

- a Regulatory Authority as defined in the *MVRMA*;
- a Responsible Minister as defined in the *MVRMA*;
- a Federal Minister as defined in the *MVRMA*; or,
- an advisor to the Review Board.

## **Developer**

The developer is expected to respond in a suitable and timely manner to directions and requests issued by the Review Board. Such requests include but are not necessarily limited to Information Requests, requests for translation of documents, and the request for the developer's presence at Public Hearings.

The developer may present additional information at any time to the Review Board beyond what was requested during the EA process. The Review Board encourages the developer to continue consulting all potentially affected communities and organizations during the EA process.

## **Other Parties**

In addition to the expertise available from within government, the Review Board may choose to hire expert advisors to provide technical expertise on specific aspects of the EA.

First Nations, NGOs, the public and other interested parties may provide the Review Board with information relevant to the EA of their own volition, or they may be asked by the Review Board to provide any relevant information they may have.

## **5.2 Milestones**

Table 1 summarizes the milestones and responsibilities in the EA process.

**Table 1 - Milestones and Responsibility Assignments for Phases in the EA Process**

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Developer</b>	<b>Government Bodies</b>	<b>Other Parties</b>	<b>Review Board and Staff</b>
EA start-up				✓
Prepare draft Terms of Reference and Work Plan				✓
Review and comment on draft ToR and WP	✓	✓	✓	
Revise and approve final ToR and WP				✓
Submit DAR	✓			

Conformity Check and Deficiency Statement (if required)				✓
Deficiency Statement Response	✓			
Information Requests		✓	✓	✓
Information Request Responses	✓	✓	✓	
Public Hearing (at the Review Board's discretion)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Technical Analysis		✓	✓	✓
Review Board Report of EA and Reasons for Decision				✓
Response from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (if required)		✓		
Consultation - throughout / as required	✓	✓	✓	✓

### **5.3 Deliverables**

The following section lists and explains the various deliverables or milestones during the EA process. They are listed in the order they will be produced.

***Public Registry, public notification, government notification, developer notification, expert advisor identification, identification of EA roles.***

The Review Board has initiated the notification measures required by the *MVRMA*. The Review Board has opened the Public Registry on the EA. The Public Registry will be updated regularly. The Review Board will identify expert advisors as required.

***Approved Terms of Reference and Work Plan.***

This Draft Terms of Reference and Work Plan for completing the EA was developed and approved by the Review Board. A final Terms of Reference and Work Plan will be developed incorporating comments on the draft document received from parties.

This document contains the scope of the development, the scope of the assessment, directions to the developer, a description of the EA process and an EA schedule.

***Developer's Assessment Report.***

Paramount Resources will use this document to guide the preparation of the DAR. Although the format of the DAR is largely left to the discretion of the developer, the developer should consider the use of appendices for providing some information, the use of a glossary for technical or uncommon terms and the clarity and accuracy of the information presented in the DAR. Diagram, charts and maps are useful for clarifying information presented in text.

### ***Conformity Check, Review Board Deficiency Statement and developers' response.***

The Review Board will review the Developer's Assessment Report to ensure that the developer has provided the information required. If needed, the Review Board will issue a deficiency statement identifying those areas in which the developer has not provided information to address an item listed in the scope of the assessment. The developer will be asked to submit information to the Review Board to fill the information gaps identified by the deficiency statement.

### ***Information Requests and Responses to Information Requests***

Information Requests are very specific and focused requests for clarification or additional information. They may be required for the Review Board to complete its analysis and reach a conclusion about the information provided by the developer. The first round of Information Requests that are issued will be developed by the Review Board. The second round will be open to all EA participants.

IRs can be issued by any party in the EA and can be directed to any other party. However, all IRs must be submitted to the Review Board for approval and they must also be submitted in the form required by the Review Board. If approved, the Review Board will then issue the Information Request under its authority to the intended Information Requests recipient. The Information Requests and the responses will be included in the Public Registry and be used as evidence for the consideration of the Review Board.

### ***Public Hearing***

The Review Board may call a hearing at any time during the process. The conduct of Public Hearings is governed by the Review Board's Rules of Procedure.

### ***Technical reports from EA parties***

The Review Board staff will undertake the analysis of the EA with the assistance of federal and territorial governments, First Nations, the public, and other interested parties. A thorough analysis of the development is essential to assist the Review Board to make the best EA decision. This is a critical stage in the EA process where the key issues and impacts are identified and evaluated. The developer can formally provide and present its views on the information brought to the Review Board's attention including any proposed amendments, additions or refinements to the development or the environmental assessment documents. The technical reports from EA parties are to clearly state the reviewer's conclusions, recommendations and supporting rationales.

### ***Review Board's Report of Environmental Assessment (EA Decision)***

The Review Board will provide the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) with its Report of Environmental Assessment as per Section 128(2) of the MVRMA. The Minister of INAC will distribute the report to every responsible minister as per 128(2)(a) of the MVRMA. The developer and the other EA parties will also receive copies of the Review Board's Report of EA. The Review Board will also provide the National Energy Board as Designated Regulatory Agency under the MVRMA with its Report of Environmental Assessment as per Section 128(2).



### 5.3 Schedule

Table 2 provides estimated time lines for the completion of each milestone in the EA process. Days refer to working days. Please be aware that many of the milestones require Board approval and that some time is required for the Board to review submissions and to meet. The Review Board may amend the schedule at its discretion. The short scenario assumes that all tasks will be completed in the shorter time given under 'duration', while the long scenario assumes all tasks will require the maximum time. It is expected that the actual completion date of the EA will fall somewhere in between.

**Table 2 - EA Schedule**

Milestone	Duration		Anticipated Completion	
	Min	Max	Early	Late
Start Up of EA	1	1	24-Jun-03	24-Jun-03
Draft Terms of Reference and Work Plan	4	4	30-Jun-03	30-Jun-03
Comment Period on Draft ToR and WP	10	10	15-Jul-03	15-Jul-03
Terms of Reference and Work Plan	10	12	29-Jul-03	31-Jul-03
Developers Assessment Report	20	40	27-Aug-03	29-Sep-03
Conformity Check and Deficiency Statement (if required)	6	10	05-Sep-03	14-Oct-03
Developer's response to Deficiency Statement	6	10	15-Sep-03	28-Oct-03
Review Board's Information Requests	10	15	29-Sep-03	19-Nov-03
Open Information Requests	10	15	14-Oct-03	10-Dec-03
Developer's response to Information Requests	10	20	28-Oct-03	12-Jan-04
Public Hearing (may be scheduled any time during the proceedings)				
Technical Analysis Reports	15	20	19-Nov-03	09-Feb-04
Closure of Public Registry	1	1	20-Nov-03	10-Feb-04
Review Board Decision and Report of EA	15	20	11-Dec-03	09-Mar-04
Federal Minister's Response to Report of EA				