

JD Roche

From: Beth Vardy
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2005 10:58 AM
To: Andy Parker
Cc: Document Control
Subject: FW: DFO comments on EnCana's addendums
Categories: 30-008-20 / NS General, 75-525-3

-----Original Message-----

From: Zamora, Phil [mailto:ZamoraP@mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2005 10:56 AM
To: Beth Vardy
Cc: Kirstein, Friederike: EC; McDonald, Derek: EC; Potter, Ted; Penney-Ferguson, Marci; Worcester, Tana
Subject: DFO comments on EnCana's addendums to the Validity of 2001/2002 E IA's and to the EA of VSP's

Beth:

DFO has reviewed the addendum to **Validity of the June 2001 Environmental Impact Assessment of Exploratory Wells in the Lower Musquodoboit, Huckleberry and Southampton and the November 2002 Environmental Impact Assessment of Exploratory Wells in Margaree, Grand-Pre and Cohasset**. The following comments are offered:

- At the bottom of page 10, for the discussion of negligible effects on fish, no rationale is given but rather a reference to studies conducted by CEF Consultants Ltd. in 2002. The type of rationale DFO was looking for is captured very well in Response 4 of the addendum to the EA of VSP's where it is explained why effects are negligible for the Northern and Spotted wolffish.

DFO has reviewed the addendum to **Environmental Assessment -Vertical Seismic Profiles on Lower Musquodoboit, Margaree, Hucklberry, Grand Pre, and Cohasset**. The following comments are offered:

- In Response 2, does not clarify whether the additional VSP surveys will be conducted during the same time of year as for the Dominion J-14. If the second sentence were to read "If there are any changes (such as listing of new species, new findings about a Species at Risk key habitat or critical activities, e.g. spawning or breeding, or work taking place at a different time of year) that are relevant to this VSP project, updated information will be submitted to the Board.", it would satisfy this particular concern.
- In Response 4, in the second paragraph, EnCana uses the argument that previous seismic surveys "have shown that the potential loss of eggs and larvae was within natural variability". With Species at Risk, this argument does not translate to no SARA impact because potentially, any loss without a permit is prohibited. However, the rationale used later on in this paragraph regarding the Northern and Spotted wolffish (the only SARA listed species likely to occur in the project area) is a good one.

If there are any questions please feel free to contact me at (902) 426-4692.

11/18/2005

Phil Zamora

11/18/2005