

**Fish, Food and Allied Workers**

Please clarify if the proponent intends to locate the Fisheries Liaison Officer on the seismic vessel, which is recommended by the C-NLOPB's Geophysical, Geological, Environmental and Geotechnical Programs Guidelines (January 2012).

**Fisheries and Oceans Canada**

Please provide a table detailing landings and values by fleet (fleet breakdown < 64°11' and > 65') by species for subdivisions in NAFO area 4R.

**Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board**

**Comment 48**

There is confusion with regard to the “Project Area”. It is stated on page 6 of the July 18, 2012 environmental assessment (EA) report that “The Project Area in any given time frame would encompass up to the three EL held by Ptarmigan (EL 1120, EL1127 and EL1128) plus the 10 km turning radii required by seismic vessels and related equipment”. It is also stated in the EA report (page 6) that “The temporal boundaries of the Project are 2012 to 2021”. Therefore, the “Project Area” for programs that may occur during the 2012 to 2021 timeframe should be identified on a figure and the size and coordinates provided, as per pages 4 and 5 of the May 7, 2012 Scoping Document which states “*The EA report shall clearly describe the spatial boundaries (e. g. Study Area, Project Area) and shall include figures, maps and the corner-point coordinates*”. Figure 2-1 identified the 2012 to 2014 “Project Area”. The use of this terminology in this instance may be causing confusion. The area identified in Figure 2-1 could be labelled the “2012 to 2014 seismic program area” to avoid confusion. Ptarmigan should also confirm that the “Project Area” assessed in the EA Report is the larger Project Area that includes the three ELs and turning radii and not just the 2012 to 2014 “Project Area”.

It is also stated in the November 28, 2012 Ptarmigan Response to EA Report Comments of Reviewers that “*Future Project and Study Area (beyond 2014) will be determined at a future date and provided in the EA validation.*” Section 5.1.1 Spatial Boundaries of the Scoping Document states that the Project Area is the area “in which seismic survey activities are to occur, including the area of the buffer zone normally defined for line changes”. The Study (or Affected) Area is the area which could potentially be affected by project activities beyond the “Project Area”. Both of these areas should be identified in the EA Report and should include the area in which all activities that could be proposed during the 2012 to 2021 temporal boundary are included. It is not acceptable to identify “Future Project and Study Areas (beyond 2014) in the “EA Validation”.

**Comment 55**

Please expand on the statement “*The Qalipu are very supportive of Ptarmigan’s activities in the region*”.

**Comment 56**

*“Consultations were held in Stephenville and Lark Harbour on July 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, respectively.”* Were any additional issues raised during these consultation sessions than those identified in Table 3.1 in the EA Report?

**Comment 60**

The response to Comment Number 60 regarding geohazard programs is puzzling. The following statements are made in the EA Report.

- Section 1.0 Introduction, pg 1 - “The Project also proposes localized geohazard well site surveys”; and
- Section 2.0 Project Description, pg 5 – “Localized geohazard well site surveys may occur as part of the proposed Project in one or more years between 2012 and 2021.”

Also, geohazard survey activities are described on page 16 in Section 2.2.7 Seismic Streamers. If geohazard surveys are proposed between 2012 and 2021 then this EA Report would be the appropriate place to assess this activity.

**Additional Comment – Sensitive Areas**

A number of sensitive areas (e.g. Cod Spawning Area) have been identified. For project activities that may occur in or near sensitive areas, non-standard mitigation or restrictions on activities will likely be required.

**St. Lawrence Coalition**

In the original EA Report, the proponent indicates that the seismic surveys will be held between October and January, outside of the fishing season. This mitigation measure, temporal avoidance of other ocean users, is now in question. Does the proponent intend on shooting in the October to January window (2013-2014)? Does the proponent intend to shoot during the fishing season, and if so, what will be the additional mitigation measures to avoid impacting fish harvesters and other marine life?