
From: Michelle Camilleri [mailto:Michelle.Camilleri@cnrl.com]
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Sarabpreet Singh
Cc: Winnie Chan; ammar.baig@ercb.ca; Corinne Kristensen; Amit Banerjee
Subject: RE: Supplemental Information Request Response #8 - Kirby Expansion Project

Good Afternoon Sarabpreet,

We have updated our SIR 8 response to include the information requested below. Our responses to the clarification requests 1-5 can be found in the Assessment of Potential Impacts to Wildlife Section, specifically on Pages 5 and 9-11 of the updated response. The response to request 6 can be found in Part (h), Pages 13-14 of the updated response.

To maintain the context of the overall response, and to make it easier for this information to be placed on the public record and for sharing with our stakeholders, we thought it more appropriate to update the response in its entirety. However to facilitate your review we would be more than happy to provide a version that shows where specifically the changes to the response were made if needed.

If you have any additional questions or concerns please do not hesitate to let me know.

Thanks,

Michelle Camilleri
403-386-8113

From: Sarabpreet Singh [mailto:sarabpreet.singh@gov.ab.ca]
Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2013 3:33 PM
To: Michelle Camilleri
Cc: Winnie Chan; ammar.baig@ercb.ca; Corinne Kristensen; Amit Banerjee
Subject: RE: Supplemental Information Request Response #8 - Kirby Expansion Project

Hi Michelle,

I am emailing in regards to the review of CNRL response to Question no. 8 of SIR 3.

As I spoke to you yesterday, ESRD requires clarification to the statements presented below (1 to 5) and a response to no. 6, before we could make our decision on EIA completeness.

1. CNRL states in the Assessment of Potential Effects to Wildlife (Page 5), "*Therefore, using the*

revised study area and Baseline Case and Application Case disturbance layers, although the total area disturbed is greater, the incremental effect of the Project-related disturbance, as a percentage increase of disturbed areas in the revised study area, is actually less than that predicted in the EIA.”

The phrase “*is actually less than that predicted in the EIA*” gives the impression that the outcome of the disturbance will be smaller than that originally predicted. However, the reduction in percentage increase of disturbed areas appears to be an artifact of the adjusted LSA size and the use of a relative measure (percentage). The disturbance associated with the project is greater than that reported in the EIA. Clarify.

2. CNRL states in the Assessment of Potential Effects to Wildlife (Page 9), “*The increased amount of disturbance related to the Project in the reassessment does not result in a change to the environmental consequences for wildlife habitat for reasons described above.*”, and “*Increased disturbances will also not result in a change to the environmental consequences for wildlife abundance or barriers to movement.*”

The reasons are related to sources describing fragmentation impacts on birds, CNRL's commitment to the use of low impact seismic (LIS), and to the generalized restoration commitments. However, the discussion of effects on caribou, wolf and deer, does not support the conclusions, and from a more general wildlife perspective, species other than birds, caribou, wolf and deer are not discussed. Clarify.

3. CNRL concluded that, “*the effects of the increased disturbance related to the Project will not result in a measurable decline in wildlife abundance at the revised study area or RSA scale beyond that predicted in the EIA.*”

How this conclusion was rendered at the revised study area scale is unclear given CNRL reports an increase in disturbance in the new LSA. Clarify.

4. CNRL states in the Assessment of Potential Effects to Wildlife (Page 10), “*Because environmental consequences to habitat are not predicted to increase from those predicted in the EIA, neither are the environmental consequences predicted in the EIA for barriers to movement.*”

How this conclusion was rendered is unclear. Clarify.

5. CNRL states, “*The increased amount of Project-related disturbance in this reassessment is due largely to LIS, which has little effect on wildlife behaviour and regenerates quickly (Bayne et al. 2011).*”

The Bayne reference relates to birds, marten and bear. CNRL has generalized the results to all wildlife behaviour., Bayne et al. 2011 found that marten avoided areas of high seismic line density. Clarify.

6. With respect to Woodland Caribou Assessment, CNRL has committed to undertaking caribou habitat restoration efforts but did not provide quantitative commitments to restoration levels that would assist in this understanding.

Provide quantitative assessment of caribou habitat restoration.

Please note that an email response for clarification and/or to provide additional information would be fine with us.

Regards,

Sarabpreet Singh, M.Sc., P.Ag.

Environmental Assessment Coordinator

Environment and Sustainable Resource Development

#111 Twin Atria Building, 4999 - 98 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta T6B 2X3
Phone: (780) 643-1669
Email: Sarabpreet.Singh@gov.ab.ca

From: Michelle Camilleri [<mailto:Michelle.Camilleri@cnrl.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 4:14 PM
To: ken.schuldhaus@ercb.ca; Corinne Kristensen; Amit Banerjee
Cc: Sarabpreet Singh; Winnie Chan; steve.thomas@ercb.ca; patrick.mcdonald@ercb.ca;
ammar.baig@ercb.ca; Anita Sartori
Subject: RE: Supplemental Information Request Response #8 - Kirby Expansion Project

Good Afternoon,

Following the filing of the Supplemental Information Request Response #8 yesterday we noticed some minor calculation errors in the "Observation Wells and Access" Column of Table 8-2. We have since corrected those calculations and any associated text and are providing the following updated response for your review. Please update your records accordingly.

This correction does not affect the conclusions of the reassessment.

We sincerely apologize for any confusion. If you have any questions regarding the changes please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks and have a great weekend!

Michelle Camilleri
403-386-8113

From: Michelle Camilleri
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2013 4:11 PM
To: ken.schuldhaus@ercb.ca; corinne.kristensen@gov.ab.ca; amit.banerjee@gov.ab.ca
Cc: sarabpreet.singh@gov.ab.ca; winnie.chan@gov.ab.ca; steve.thomas@ercb.ca;
patrick.mcdonald@ercb.ca; ammar.baig@ercb.ca; Anita Sartori
Subject: Supplemental Information Request Response #8 - Kirby Expansion Project

Good Afternoon,

Please find enclosed the response to Supplemental Information Request #8 provided by the ERCB on March 8th, 2013. The response is provided as a supplement to the responses filed on May 13th, 2013.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the attached please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks,

Michelle Camilleri

Canadian Natural Resources Ltd.
855-2nd Street SW, Calgary Alberta T2P 4J8
Phone: 403-386-8113
Cell: 403-807-8150
Email: Michelle.Camilleri@cnrl.com

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail.