Federal Authority Advice Record (FAAR)

FAAR Response must be submitted by September 29, 2026

Eastern Bridge Project – Public Services and Procurement Canada – Ontario and Quebec

Canadian Impact Assessment Registry (CIAR) Reference Number: 90709

Department/Agency	Natural ressources Canada
Lead Contact	Genevieve Poitras
Full Address	580 booth street
Email	genevieve.poitras@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca
Telephone	
Alternate Contact	Annie Montpetit

1. Will your department or agency exercise a **power, perform a duty or function**, or provide **financial assistance**, related to the project to enable it to be carried out in whole or in part?

   As relevant,

   a) Specify the power, duty or function, or financial assistance, and the likelihood that it will be required to construct the project, based on the Initial Project Description, as either Required, Potential, Likely, Unlikely or Not Required;
      - Unlikely, unless NRCan, through its role in the administration of the Explosives Act, may exercise a power or perform a duty or function that would enable the project to proceed.

   b) Describe any associated Indigenous or public consultation, including timelines;
      - In the event that an explosives license is required, NRCan may consult the Indigenous communities potentially affected by the project.

   c) Describe any associated information requirements (e.g., alternative means assessment, habitat offsetting) and specify those that may be coordinated with the impact assessment process, if an impact assessment is required;
      - N/A

   d) Identify any associated project-specific guidance or issues of which the proponent should be aware, or information the proponent should provide; and
      - N/A

   e) Indicate whether your department or agency has identified any power that it will not be exercising or may not be able to exercise to allow the project to be carried out, in whole or in part.
      - N/A

2. **Using Table 1**, identify project- and context- specific **key issues**, based on the expertise within your mandate[1] and the information in your possession, including the Initial Project Description, any exchanges with the proponent or others related to the project and known means to address the effects of the project.

   Please note for designated projects that are a *federal work or undertaking,* such as an interprovincial bridge, per section 2 of the *Impact Assessment Act*, adverse effects within federal jurisdiction takes on a broader meaning and includes any non-negligible adverse effects on environmental, health, social or economic conditions.

   For each key issue:
   a) Specify the key issue (e.g., specific species and location);
   b) Specify the project component or activity linked to the key issue;
   c) Explain why it's a key issue based on:
      i. biophysical effect pathway(s) from the specific project component or activity;
      ii. concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate;
      iii. the issue being material[2] to decision making under the *Impact Assessment Act;*
   d) Identify how the issue could be resolved, including through means other than an impact assessment (e.g., other regulatory oversight); and
   e) Identify additional information the proponent could provide including to give confidence on how the issue can be addressed through other means.

_____
Name and title of Departmental / Agency Responder

_____
Date

[1] Refer to the Memoranda of Understanding with IAAC.

[2] An issue is material to decision making if its analysis is anticipated to affect the conclusions on (1) whether adverse effects within federal jurisdiction or direct and incidental adverse effects (collectively adverse federal effects) are likely not significant, or of low, medium or high significance; (2) appropriate mitigation measures for significant adverse federal effects; or (3) justification in the public interest.

Table 1: Key Issues to inform the impact assessment process

This table should outline key issues to inform the impact assessment process, including whether an impact assessment is required and, if so, the scope of the assessment and tailoring of the Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines. Key issues are the major concerns directly related to a project component or activity, the analysis of which is anticipated to be material to decision-making under the *Impact Assessment Act*.
Federal authorities' advice should be guided by the identification and resolution of key issues. If an impact assessment is required, it will be focused on key issues.

Comment ID	a) Key issue	b) Project component or activity	c)(i) Biophysical effect pathway(s)	c)(ii) Concern unique to the project or a priority within your mandate	c)(iii) Material to federal decision-making	d) Means for issue resolution	e) Additional information from the proponent

Identify comments by organization and comment number.
 	
e.g.: IAAC-01
	Specify the key issue (e.g., specific species and location).	*Identify the project component or activity linked to the key issue.*
		
		Be specific about the nature, scale, novelty and complexity or the component or activity.
			Identify the specific biophysical effect pathway between the project component or activity and the affected environmental or human receptor (including Indigenous Peoples).	*Describe why it's a key issue within the mandate of your department or agency, including in terms of priorities of the federal government and in terms of anticipated likelihood, severity or uncertainty of effects.*
				
				Identify if the key issue is common for projects of this nature or in this sector, or whether it's unique to this project due to its complexity, size or novelty; a sensitive or rare receiving environment; and/or proximity of sensitive environmental or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples).
					Describe why the key issue is material to decision-making as either:
					• *an adverse effect within federal jurisdiction, or a direct or incidental adverse effect, that may be significant based on available evidence including:*
					  ○ *federal experts' knowledge and experience with past project assessments;*
					  ○ *presence of sensitive species, habitats or human receptors (including Indigenous Peoples);*
					  ○ *novel or complex project activities, components or technologies;*
					  ○ *high uncertainties in effects or in the effectiveness of mitigation measures;*
					  ○ *unknown or unproven mitigation; or*
					• *a factor for the justification in the public interest anticipated to be material to decision-making such as a likely positive effect contributing to sustainability, to Canada's environmental obligations or climate change commitments or in supporting governmental priorities, such as reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples.*
						Describe how the key issue could be resolved or addressed by:
						• *Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance that your department or agency has;*
						• *Any means, including powers, duties, functions, frameworks, policies or guidance from another jurisdiction, including the province;*
						• *Common, proven, well-understood or standard mitigation measures to mitigate the effect or effect pathway(s); or*
						• *Commitments made by the proponent (e.g., in the Initial Project Description).*
							Describe information the proponent can provide, or commitments the proponent can make, in their Response to the Summary of Issues that would provide confidence that the issue can be resolved by existing means.
							
							Consider whether information, studies, analyses or collaborative work with other authorities would be required to address the issue beyond existing means.

NRCan-01	Seismicity	Seismic hazards		Section 14.1.3 (IPD August 2026) geophysical environment, section 19.1.3.4 avoidance and mitigation measures	Seismic hazards could have a potential adverse effect on project valued components and public safety.	The proponent should expand the discussion of seismicity, including more recent earthquake events in the vicinity of the site and a more comprehensive assessment of the regional seismic hazard. Site conditions across the project area should be confirmed through in situ measurements, as the estimates presented by Hunter et al. (2012) may not provide sufficient spatial resolution to adequately characterize site variability.	NRCan recommends the proponent to include more recent earthquake/seismic events that occur/occurred in the vicinity of the site. NRCan recommends the

						In accordance with the requirements and guidance of the applicable standards (e.g., CSA S6:25), the proponent should evaluate the need for a site-specific seismic response analysis. This evaluation should be sufficiently detailed and commensurate with the project and site conditions and should clearly justify whether a site-specific analysis is required and, if so, its appropriate scope. Particular consideration should be given to the presence of Site Class F, conditions and other site characteristics that may not be adequately represented by the national code hazard values (see NBCC 2025, Clause A-4.1.8.4), including the seismic behaviour of the potentially highly sensitive glaciomarine clays present along the selected corridor. Seismic hazard values should be referenced to, and cited in accordance with, the most recent edition of the National Building Code of Canada (NBCC 2025). In section 14.1.3.2 seismic site classification the proponent mentions that they have used NBCC 2020 seismic hazard tool. https://www.seismescanada.rncan.gc.ca/hazard-alea/simphaz-en.php	proponent to do a more comprehensive assessment of the regional seismic hazard.
NRCan-02	Landslides	Terrain hazards		Section 19.1.3.4 avoidance and mitigation measures (IPD August 2026)	Landslides could have a potential adverse effect on project valued components and public safety.	The escarpment along the marine terrace bordering Boulevard de la Vérendrye north of the Ottawa River has been affected by large retrogressive landslides, some of which may have been induced by earthquakes (Aylsworth et al. 2000). It will be necessary to carefully assess the possibility that such landslides may occur again and to estimate their potential spatial extent.	NRCan recommends the proponent to assess the possibility of landslides around the site, including the extent.

						Aylsworth, J.M., Lawrence, D.E. & Guertin, J. 2000. Did two massive earthquakes in the Holocene induce widespread landsliding and near-surface deformation in part of the Ottawa Valley, Canada? Geology, 28(10): 903–906.	

Please insert additional rows as necessary.