

## **EMCP Comment 75: DFO 13**

### **Section 7.5.1.1**

- b) This response is considered adequate provided the following comment is addressed:

If the ferry pier remains in the same footprint as the existing infrastructure, it does not need to be discussed in Section 7.5.1.1 as it will not affect habitat quantity. Table 7-11 should be updated as well. Also, if an increase in footprint is not anticipated, reference should be made in Section 7.5.1.2 to adherence to DFO's Marine Wharf Repair/Reconstruction Operational Statement. This Operational Statement can be found at: <http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/habitat/what-quoi/os-co/nl/pdf/mwharf-eng.pdf>.

- g) This response is considered adequate provided the following comment is addressed:

The clarification provided in the response regarding what is meant by “re-establishment of moorings at the Bull Arm deepwater site” should be included in the CSR.

### **Section 7.5.1.4**

- b) This response is considered adequate provided the following comment is addressed:

The text provided by EMCP in their response leads the reader to believe that DFO is concerned about appropriate sizing of fish screens because of maintenance of adequate water flow, when in fact DFO is concerned with preventing the entrainment and/or impingement of fish. Please reword this text.

### **Section 7.5.2.3**

- b) This response is considered adequate provided the following comment is addressed:

The proponent's response indicates that the text in Section 7.5.2.3 will be revised to include a reference to the *Statement of Canadian Practice on Mitigation of Seismic Noise in the Marine Environment*, however as previously requested, Table 7-12 should also include a reference to this document as mitigation when conducting surveys.

### **Section 7.5.3.3**

- b) This response is considered adequate provided the following comment is addressed:

If geophysical, seismic, geohazard, geological and geotechnical surveys are not proposed for decommissioning and abandonment, they should be removed from Table 7-13. It is advised that environmental surveys may be required during decommissioning and abandonment and therefore should be included in the proposed text for Section 7.5.3.3.

## **EMCP Comment 28: EC 14 Regarding Offshore Wind Climate and the Offshore Extremal Wave Analysis**

Please note that the comments referenced as EC 14 concern the Offshore Wind Climate and the Offshore Extremal Wave Analysis, not just the Offshore Wind Climate, as the heading for the response would suggest.

On rereading part c of ECMP 28: EC 14 from Nov 2010, it is not clear if the additional information provided, about the adjustment of the MSC50 data used to develop the 100 year wave, was actually going to be included in the CSR. This information included the formula, the data source, and a reference for this method. This is an important modification and the additional information should be added to the CSR.

The attempt at clarification about the release of wave radar data to CNLOPB and Fisheries and Oceans is appreciated. The situation is still not clear but may resolve in time.

The response concerning the applicability to different platform types, of different methods used in the various extremal wave analyses, is appreciated. It would still be advisable to include in the CSR the uncertainty range for the 100 year wave value from the chosen method. However it is presumably included in the original report and available for use.

For any further analysis that may be conducted, the proponent is advised to consider further examination of available wave data (from both radar and wave buoys) as it applies to adjusting the MSC50 wave heights prior to the extremal analysis. The equation used to adjust the MSC50 wave heights was based on wave radar data for which validation information is not widely available. It did not seem to make use of years of data from wave buoys considered the standard reference for other sources of wave information.

## **EMCP Comment 129: EC 46 Regarding Attraction of Seabirds to Platforms**

This response is considered adequate, provided the following comment is addressed:

A portion of EMCP's response should be reworded as follows:

“The program design would be developed in consultation with Environment Canada's Canadian Wildlife Service, and would be completed prior to platform start-up in 2017. It is anticipated that field testing would begin upon completion of platform start-up and commissioning activities offshore.”