

APPENDIX A

Summary of Issues Responses

1.0 APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF ISSUES RESPONSES

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
Accidents and Malfunctions			
1	Need for further information on potential accident and malfunction scenarios that could lead to the release of contaminants into the surrounding environment for each phase of the Project, the potential effects on human health, and emergency management plans.	Further information on potential accident and malfunction scenarios, the potential effects on human health, and emergency response planning are detailed in Appendix D.	Appendix D
2	Concerns regarding fuel storage including Proponent requirement to follow all storage limit regulations outlined in the <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999</i> (CEPA) and have an emergency preparedness plan that follows CEPA.	The Project will follow all fuel storage limit regulations required by <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999</i> . Further information on emergency response planning is detailed in Appendix D.	Section 24.1 of the DPD and Appendix D
Acoustic Environment			
3	Need for further information on proposed noise mitigation measures during the construction phase, including details on the complaint resolution process and information on noise monitoring and follow-up measures.	<p>The Proponent will provide residents living near the Project with a telephone number and email address that can be used to report concerns about the Project, including concerns about noise from Project construction and/or operations activities.</p> <p>Specific actions taken in response to a noise complaint will depend on the nature of the complaint. In response to persistent noise complaints from a particular resident (or group of residents), the Proponent may undertake monitoring to characterize noise levels and evaluate the magnitude of impacts based relevant thresholds from Health Canada Guidance and/or Alberta Transportation Guidance. The minimum duration of any noise monitoring undertaken in response to a complaint would be 24 hours, and the monitoring would endeavour to replicate environmental conditions (e.g., wind direction) consistent with the complaint.</p> <p>If monitoring indicates that Project noise levels are unacceptable (i.e., in excess of relevant thresholds), the Proponent will implement mitigation to reduce noise impacts. Again, the specific mitigation measures would depend on the nature of the noise impact. For example, if unacceptable noise impacts result from Project traffic on Range Road 264 north of Cell 3, the Proponent may implement a traffic management plan that requires Project traffic to approach Cell 3 from the south and prohibits or restricts Project traffic from heading north on Range Road 264 when exiting Cell 3. If unacceptable noise impacts result from back-up alarms on mobile construction equipment, the Proponent may redesign and/or relocate laydown areas to reduce the need for equipment to operate in reverse.</p>	Section 24.4 of the DPD and Section 7.0 in Appendix G
Alternatives to the Project			
4	Concerns regarding the “need for” and “purpose of” the proposed Project.	The Proponent understands some stakeholders are concerned about the use of agricultural land for industrial development. To confirm that this land use is appropriate, the Proponent is pursuing the required municipal permits and zoning through Wheatland County.	Section 7 of the DPD
Atmospheric Environment			
5	Need for ambient air quality monitoring to confirm results of modelling and assess air quality against the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards to assess potential effects to human health from air pollutants, based on predicted concentrations.	<p>A detailed review of project construction and operations-based emissions has been completed to appropriately contextualize the facility’s potential to change local air quality. Construction emissions, which are expected to be at their greatest during the first year of construction when land-clearing and soil stripping operations are being undertaken, have been estimated for criteria air compounds (CACs) including nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulphur dioxide (SO₂) particulate matter consisting of particles nominally smaller than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}), carbon monoxide (CO) and for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Operational emissions are expected to be lower than construction emissions. These construction and operations emission estimates are presented in Section 24.3 and have been developed using the same assumptions basis as were used in the GHG emissions assessment (Section 23 and Section 2.0 in Appendix M).</p> <p>The estimated emissions, combined with the short construction period as calculated and presented in Section 24.3 above suggest that the value of dispersion modelling and project-specific air quality monitoring is low. The emissions are relatively low during construction, local and ephemeral. When construction is complete, and potential effects will be fully reversed. Operational emissions are expected to be no more significant than those typical of a light-industrial area. Refer to Section 24.3 for a summary of construction and operations emissions.</p> <p>If air quality concerns from construction or operations are raised by stakeholders, the Proponent will respond promptly to address any issues.</p>	Section 24.3 of the DPD and Section 2.0 in Appendix M

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
6	Need for air quality assessment including baseline sampling and dispersion modelling, for all substances or air pollutants generated during each phase of the Project: nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide, dust, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, ozone, volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic compounds, metals and other substances that may be released.	Baseline air quality conditions are measured regionally through the Calgary Region Airshed Zone (CRAZ) in southeast Calgary and in Airdrie for NO ₂ , SO ₂ , PM _{2.5} , CO, and total hydrocarbons through this program. The ongoing operation of this network is anticipated through the construction and operations period. The estimated emissions, combined with the short construction period as calculated and presented in Section 24.3 above suggest that the value of dispersion modelling is low. The emissions are relatively low during construction, local and ephemeral. When construction is complete, and potential effects will be fully reversed. Operational emissions are expected to be no more significant than those typical of a light-industrial area. Refer to Section 24.3 for a summary of construction and operations emissions.	Section 24.3 of the DPD
7	Recommend using equipment with engines that meet Tier 4 emission standards that will assist in mitigating the air quality impacts of the Project.	Tier 4 vehicles will used to the extent possible and will be considered an asset for vendors during the procurement process but will not be required to be a selected vendor.	Section 24.3 of the DPD
8	Recommend including the location of sensitive receptors (e.g., hospitals, schools, retirement complexes, assisted care homes) and traditional land use areas when identifying potential Project-related air quality impacts on human health.	One hospital, Strathmore District Health Services, and several schools, retirement complexes and assisted care homes in Langdon and Strathmore were identified within a six to 13 km range from the Project site. A list of sensitive receptors is provided below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strathmore District Health Services (Hospital) • Langdon School • Sarah Thompson School (Langdon) • Westmount School (Strathmore) • Strathmore High School (Strathmore) • Wheatland Housing Management Body, Ranch Estates, Lambert Village (Retirement homes, Strathmore) • AgeCare Sagewood (assisted care home, Strathmore) Location of traditional land use areas is not available as Traditional Land Use Studies have not been made available to the Proponent.	Section 13d of the DPD
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
9	Clarify the Project's greenhouse gas emissions and contribution to climate change with consideration of the Strategic Assessment of Climate Change and the Government of Canada's long-term goal to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. Provide a description of the planned mitigation measures, technologies, and best practices to be applied, including measures being considered to reduce the Project's greenhouse gas emissions on an ongoing basis.	As part of their review, Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) provided comments regarding GHGs, specifically clarifying and confirming the GHG emissions associated with electricity, clarifying the land clearing calculations as per the Strategic Assessment on Climate Change (SACC), as well as providing additional information regarding mitigation measures and a net zero plan. The following provides responses to ECCC's comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Errors to the calculations for building electricity for the year 2039 have been corrected. b) The building electricity and heating emissions increase in the year 2042 as that is when the second half of Cell 1 is assumed to become operational. Explanation has been added to Sections 2.1.2 and 2.3 in Appendix M. c) Proposed mitigation measures have been outlined in Section 2.4 of Appendix M. These are in alignment with the measures outlined in the air quality assessment. d) A net-zero plan will not be developed at this planning stage of the Project. Additional details regarding this have been added to Section 2.4 in Appendix M. e) A decommissioning phase has not been identified for the Project, therefore the GHG emissions do not include a decommissioning stage. If decommissioning were to occur in the future, it is likely that the associated GHG emissions would be similar to or less than those during the construction phase (e.g., potentially less vehicles would be involved). An explanation of this has been added to Section 2.1.1 in Appendix M. 	Section 2.1.1 and 2.4 in Appendix M
10	Describe the Project's resilience to future climate change, and where relevant, how it is considered in project design.	Project resilience to future climate change is described in Section 23 and Appendix M. The risk ranking in Section 3.5 of Appendix M identified that for the 23 potential interactions between the Project and climate events, 12 are considered low risk, nine are considered medium risk and two are considered high risk (high winds and high precipitation). Current and potential future adaptive measures are provided for each of the 23 potential interactions to help manage potential risks.	Section 23 of the DPD and Section 3.5 in Appendix M
11	Need for further study on the resilience of the Project to climate change including possible effects that may be associated with climate change, mitigation measures and potential for residual effects after mitigation has been applied.	A climate change resilience assessment is included in Section 3.0 of Appendix M. The assessment considers possible effects that may be associated with climate change, potential mitigation measures and a risk assessment looking at the risk profile of the Project to 23 potential future climate interactions. The risk profile results in risks categorized as low, medium, or high risks.	Section 23 of the DPD and Section 3.0 in Appendix M
12	Clarification required about the "one-time emissions" unit described in Table 14 of the IPD, as the value is described in terms of annual emissions. It is unclear if this is a portion of the carbon sink as it is described as a sample. Clarify what the estimate includes.	The one-time emissions represent the GHG emissions because of land clearing for construction. For the calculations, it is assumed this will be completed in a single year (2024). The unit has been changed from tCO _{2e} /year to tCO _{2e} to clarify this. This is now considered Table 16 in Appendix M. Additionally; the wording has been revised to match the terminology used in the SACC. 'One-time emissions' are now termed "direct emissions from land-use change" in Appendix M.	Section 2.2.6 and Table 16 in Appendix M

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
Cumulative Effects			
13	Cumulative effects on Indigenous peoples, including impacts on their Aboriginal and/or treaty rights due to continuous development and urbanization in the traditional territories of potentially affected Indigenous peoples.	<p>The Proponent acknowledges historic use of the area by Indigenous groups as expressed in the IAAC letters from June 2023. The Project site is on land that is privately held and has existing agricultural and industrial development, the potential for current Indigenous land use such as hunting, fishing, plant gathering, or spiritual use is limited. Further, the Project is not anticipated to affect water quality or quantity, wildlife habitat, or traditional and medicinal plants in the surrounding area, as it is not expected to generate beyond-negligible effects on air quality, water quality and quantity, or fish, wildlife, and vegetation health. The Project site is not accessible to the public nor is there access for Indigenous land use. No cumulative effects are anticipated due to the Project site's location on private lands, which consist primarily of cultivated agricultural land. As a result, effects on resources, lands, or environmental conditions key to the exercise of Treaty Rights, Métis Harvesting Rights, or Indigenous land use are not expected.</p> <p>The Proponent acknowledges that the Indigenous Peoples engaged as part of the Project have hunted, fished, and harvested in the Project area in pre- or post-contact eras, and have ancestral connections to the land. Although the landscape has changed through cultivation and later development, Indigenous Peoples may still have connections to the area. The Proponent is committed to continuing to engage with Indigenous groups as the Project advances to address their concerns and aspirations related to Project development.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.0, engagement continues, and the Proponent is committed to ongoing engagement with Indigenous groups into construction and operations for the Project to understand any concerns they may have.</p>	Section 21.1 of the DPD
Economic and Social Conditions			
14	Need for information on the proponent's hiring strategy, including anticipated training opportunities, description of the skills that may be required for potential candidates and whether there are employment barriers for under-represented groups in the labour market, such as Indigenous peoples, women, and persons with disabilities.	The Proponent's hiring and training strategy has been integrated into the Section 15.3 of the DPD. Labour market information has been disaggregated by sex and Indigeneity in the same section. Data on persons with disabilities was not publicly available.	Section 15.3 of the DPD
15	Given Wheatland County's proximity to Calgary, a significant proportion of the Project's workforce could come from that city. Recommend including the social and economic context of Calgary to provide a more fulsome picture of the potential project workforce.	Section 15 has been updated to include more social and economic context for Calgary, as Calgary is a source of potential project workforce.	Section 15
16	Recommend using the most recent statistical data when describing labour force characteristics.	Section 15 has been updated to include the most recent statistical information from the 2021 Statistics Canada Census and has been disaggregated by male and female, and Indigenous and non-Indigenous.	Section 15
Fish and Fish Habitat			
17	Project activities may lead to adverse effects on groundwater and surface water, ensure compliance with requirements under the <i>Fisheries Act</i> .	The Proponent will comply with any relevant regulatory requirements under the <i>Fisheries Act</i> . The Project design does not appear to have any regulatory requirements subject to the <i>Fisheries Act</i> .	Section 19.1
Human Health and Well-Being			
18	Need for identification and locations of existing and potential future human receptors, including sensitive receptors.	Existing human receptors near the Project site are identified in the noise assessment (Section 4.1 of Appendix G) as noise receptors considered in the assessment. A list of potential sensitive receptors has been included in response to SOI 8 and are also listed in Section 13d.	Section 4.1 of Appendix G and Section 13d of the DPD
Indigenous and Stakeholder Consultation and Engagement			
19	Need for opportunities for meaningful Indigenous engagement throughout the regulatory process, including in effects assessment, baseline studies, development of mitigation measures, identification of mutual economic benefits, employment opportunities, and understanding how Indigenous concerns and impacts to rights will be addressed.	<p>The Proponent remains committed to ongoing engagement and dialogue, with the goal of having Indigenous participation in the Project through either employment (either with the De Havilland Field Project or De Havilland Canada) or business opportunities for Indigenous businesses. The Proponent will consult with individual Indigenous Groups on a case-by-case basis regarding capacity funding to support consultation and engagement activities.</p> <p>De Havilland is engaging with Levvel Consulting to explore potential partnerships including skill training for new entrants to the aerospace industry as well as existing employee cultural training initiatives.</p> <p>De Havilland has reached out to engage with Community Futures Treaty 7, delivery partner for ISET programming, to explore partnership opportunities for training and employment with local indigenous groups.</p> <p>Early engagement with local area residents will be critical to our success in the Strathmore area. In the event we can have local Indigenous groups willing to commit to initial work assignments in the Calgary area (while the Project is under construction). Our current outreach is focussing on local (Calgary) based indigenous programming organizations; however, we are open to other opportunities as they present themselves.</p>	Section 4 and Section 22.3 of the DPD

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
Indigenous Knowledge			
20	Request to incorporate Indigenous knowledge in the Project assessment of effects, including the development of environmental management plans (e.g., Wildlife Management Plan).	Sections 14.4 and 21.0 have been updated to include Indigenous Knowledge provided from the Indigenous Groups in their IAAC letters. Language about establishing a Knowledge Sharing/Data Sharing Agreement with each community and validation measures is included in Section 21.	Section 14.4 and Section 21 of the DPD
Indigenous Peoples' Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes			
21	Clarify potential or perceived project effects to current land use, including wildlife and vegetation, corresponding potential effects to traditional food sources and food security of Indigenous peoples, and how these effects will be addressed.	Information provided by Tsuut'ina Nation, Bearspaw First Nation, Chiniki First Nation, and Goodstoney First Nation as part of their comments to IAAC have been included in Section 21.1. To date, the Proponent has not received any direct feedback on concerns related to current land use, traditional food sources or food security from the Indigenous groups engaged with. The Proponent remains committed to ongoing engagement and dialogue and will work with Indigenous communities to address any concerns raised in these areas.	Section 21.1 of the DPD
Indigenous Peoples' Health and Well-being			
22	Need for information on how the potential effects of the Project will impact Indigenous health and well-being, including potential impacts to drinking water, country foods, and increased contaminants.	The Proponent acknowledges the concerns stated in comment letters from the Indigenous communities in June 2023. Additional information has been provided in Section 22 regarding the negligible effects of the Project on vegetation, wildlife, fish and fish habitat, resulting in no anticipated health effects on consumption of country foods. Text also has been provided that indicate that Project location, distance from Indigenous settlements, low air emissions and lack of potential effects to harvested food and drinking water are not expected to impact Indigenous health.	Section 22 of the DPD
23	Recommend use of Health Canada guidance documents when assessing the health effects of the Project.	Based on the nature of the Project and the low potential for environmental risks and health risks associated with its construction and operation, standard mitigation measures as outlined throughout the DPD are expected to manage potential health risks. The noise assessment (Section 4.3 in Appendix G) included Health Canada guidance as part of its methodology. If in the future, there is requirement for the Proponent to assess other health effects, Health Canada guidance documents will be considered.	Section 4.3 in Appendix G
Indigenous Peoples' Rights			
24	Clarity on the assessment of impacts to rights and its incorporation into project effects assessment and potential mitigation measures.	<p>The Proponent acknowledges historic use of the area by Indigenous groups as expressed in the IAAC letters from June 2023. The Project site is located on land that is privately held and has existing agricultural and industrial development, the potential for current Indigenous land use such as hunting, fishing, plant gathering, or spiritual use is limited. Further, the Project is not anticipated to affect water quality or quantity, wildlife habitat, or traditional and medicinal plants in the surrounding area, as it is not expected to generate beyond-negligible effects on air quality, water quality and quantity, or fish, wildlife, and vegetation health. The Project site is not accessible to the public nor is there access for Indigenous land use. No cumulative effects are anticipated due to the Project site's location on private lands, which consist primarily of cultivated agricultural land. As a result, effects on resources, lands, or environmental conditions key to the exercise of Treaty Rights, Métis Harvesting Rights, or Indigenous land use are not expected.</p> <p>The Proponent acknowledges that the Indigenous Peoples engaged as part of the Project have hunted, fished, and harvested in the Project area in pre- or post-contact eras, and have ancestral connections to the land. Although the landscape has changed through cultivation and later development, Indigenous Peoples may still have connections to the area. The Proponent is committed to continuing to engage with Indigenous groups as the Project advances to address their concerns and aspirations related to Project development.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4, engagement continues, and the Proponent is committed to ongoing engagement with Indigenous groups into construction and operations for the Project to understand any concerns they may have.</p>	Section 21.1 of the DPD
Indigenous Peoples' Social and Economic Conditions			
25	Request for funding and capacity building for Indigenous peoples to support adequate consultation and engagement activities to identify potential effects of the Project and review project materials.	The Proponent remains committed to ongoing engagement and dialogue, with the goal of having Indigenous participation in the Project through either employment (either with the De Havilland Field Project or De Havilland Canada) or business opportunities for Indigenous businesses. The Proponent will consult with individual Indigenous Groups on a case-by-case basis regarding capacity funding to support consultation and engagement activities.	Section 4 of the DPD
26	Clarity on the intent to support diversity and inclusion through the Proponent's hiring and training strategies; need for a better understanding of the target percentage for hiring Indigenous peoples and if Indigenous Peoples who live near the Project will receive priority employment and training opportunities.	<p>The Proponent provides equal employment opportunities based on education, experience, skills, references, and availability as related to the duties and responsibilities of the position. The Proponent welcomes diversity and promote equality within their workplace and hiring practices. Employment decisions are based on business needs, job requirements and individual qualifications, without regard to race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, family status, disability, or any other status protected by the laws or regulations in the locations where they operate. The company will not tolerate discrimination or harassment based on any of these characteristics.</p> <p>At this time, there are no 'preferential' hire groups, however the Proponent is always looking to partner with organizations representing broader labour pools, especially those who look to promote those under-represented in the workforce, to provide paths to employment in their industry.</p>	Section 15.3 of the DPD

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
Indigenous Peoples' Spiritual, Physical, and Cultural Heritage			
27	Clarity on the potential effects to physical and cultural heritage, including sites of archaeological, and paleontological significance to Indigenous peoples due to the construction and operation of the Project.	<p>Additional text was added to Section 21.2 to further discuss the archaeological potential criteria that were used to review the Project.</p> <p>Alberta Culture reviewed the archaeological potential of the Project and determined that no further work was required under the Alberta <i>Historical Resources Act (HRA)</i>. HRA approval was subsequently issued for the Project.</p> <p>In the absence of Provincial HRIA requirements, the Proponent may decide to sponsor an Indigenous site visit or further consultation at their discretion.</p>	Section 21.2 of the DPD
28	Clarify how Indigenous peoples will be notified should any item of historical, archeological, paleontological or spiritual importance to Indigenous peoples be discovered.	<p>In the event an item of historical, archeological, paleontological, or spiritual importance to Indigenous peoples is discovered, the Proponent will inform local Indigenous groups to consult on appropriate mitigation measures as outlined in the following process.</p> <p>During construction of the proposed Project, if any sites, structures, or items of historical, archaeological, paleontological, or spiritual significance to Indigenous groups are identified, the Proponent and its contractors will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Stop work and flag the area to prevent any further disturbance. 2) Workers will notify the Proponent who will contact a Resource Specialist. 3) No potential archaeological or paleontological sites will be further disturbed or affected until the Resource Specialist has consulted with the Provincial Regulator to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. 4) The Proponent will also notify local Indigenous groups of these discoveries to consult on proposed mitigation measures. 5) This contingency plan will be included in the Environmental Protection Plan for the Project. 	Section 21.2 of the DPD
Migratory Birds and their Habitat			
29	Recommend the use of deterrents and water level management at the stormwater facilities to discourage their use by migratory birds.	The Proponent will use bird deterrent and/or water level management for the stormwater facilities at the Project to discourage their use by migratory birds, as practical. The details for these mitigations have not been finalized yet and will be finalized working with Transport Canada and NAV CANADA.	Section 19.2 of the DPD
Navigation			
30	Clarity required on whether any project component (including incidental activities) may impact a navigable waterway and if so, more information required on potential impacts to navigable waterways and any potential mitigation measures.	The Project will not impact a navigable waterway; however, if there are design changes that may have an impact to a navigable waterway, the Proponent will obtain proper approvals from Transport Canada.	Section 18 of the DPD

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
31	Clarity required on whether any project component (including incidental activities) may cause an obstacle to air navigation.	<p>No project components are expected to cause an obstacle to air navigation at the Project site or at other aerodromes in the area.</p> <p>Proposed air operations at the De Havilland Field will be limited in frequency, likely in the realm of two to six movements per week over the next three years and deployed gradually. Overall, the Proponent anticipates that the Project would not have a substantial impact on current aircraft movements in the region. The Proponent will also provide appropriate safeguards (i.e., reporting of quarterly forecasts, coordination with NAV CANADA) are put in place so that the aerodrome does not interfere with the normal course of airspace activities in the region.</p> <p>The Proponent provided a proposal for the Project to NAV CANADA for comment. On February 23, 2023, NAV CANADA responded indicating there are no objections to the Project as submitted (Appendix L), as long as the following conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed runway orientation remains as proposed; north – south (15-33) direction and generally aligned with main runways at Calgary International Airport (17L-35R and 17R-35L). • Should you decide to have this aerodrome registered or certified, a formal request must be made to Transport Canada. Once all information is approved by Transport Canada, a request will then be made to NAV CANADA Data Collections (AISData@navcanada.ca) for publication. • Arrival and departure procedures will have to be designed that do not conflict with the Calgary International Airport traffic flows. Occasionally, the De Havilland Field traffic will have to be kept at lower altitudes until clear of conflicting traffic flows. • When Runway 11/29 at Calgary International Airport is in usage, which is very infrequent and ~2% of the time, the De Havilland Field flights may have to wait for breaks in traffic to depart. • Higher altitude flight test areas will have to be located east of the Calgary Terminal airspace. • Any changes to this proposal must be sent to NAV CANADA for re-evaluation of impacts. <p>The NAV CANADA assessment does not constitute an approval and/or permit from other agencies.</p>	Section 18.1 of the DPD
32	Clarity on whether the Project will meet the requirements of the Canadian Aviation Regulations, including detailing how the lighting and marking of buildings and obstacles will be completed before flights begin.	The Proponent will comply with the Canadian Aviation Regulation (CAR) 307. The Proponent provided a proposal for the Project to NAV CANADA for comment. On February 23, 2023, NAV CANADA responded indicating there are no objections to the Project as submitted, as long as conditions listed in the response to SOI 31 above are met.	Section 18.1 of the DPD
33	Clarity on whether any proposed buildings are within the Obstacle Limitation Surface under the <i>Canadian Aviation Regulations</i>	No buildings are within the Obstacle Limitation Surface. The Proponent will comply with the <i>Canadian Aviation Regulations</i> .	Section 18.1 of the DPD
34	Recommend detailing how the Project will meet regulation TP 1247 Aviation - Land Use in the Vicinity of Aerodromes.	The Proponent continues to work with Transport Canada and NAV CANADA on the required regulatory requirements for the Project. The requirements for TP-1247 have not been discussed with Transport Canada and NAV CANADA yet in this process. The Proponent will comply with any requirements or Transport Canada/NAV CANADA conditions related to TP-1247.	Section 18.1 of the DPD
Species at Risk, Terrestrial Wildlife, and their Habitat			
35	Recommend providing the amphibian survey methodology and timing, and detail appropriate mitigation measures for any potential impacts to Northern Leopard Frog and Western Tiger Salamander.	<p>During 2023 field surveys (May 29 and June 22) conducted by Trace Associates Inc., visual surveys were conducted for Western Tiger Salamanders, and none were observed. Surveys indicated the wetlands on site are not deep enough to support Northern Leopard Frog, and none have been recorded in the area.</p> <p>The Proponent will mitigate the potential effects to Western Tiger Salamander during construction. Pre-construction surveys will be conducted to identify amphibian species of management concern in wetlands and appropriate site-specific mitigation developed.</p>	Section 14.4 of the DPD
Vulnerable Population Groups (Gender Based Analysis Plus)			
36	Clarity on the mitigation of negative impacts associated with an influx of workers in local communities such as safety and security plans.	The Project construction workforce is estimated to be 320 to 400 workers and the full operations workforce is estimated to be 1,500 workers. The Project workforce is expected to be drawn primarily from local communities (Wheatland County and surrounding region including the Town of Strathmore and the City of Calgary). No work camps will be constructed for the Project due to the sourcing from nearby local communities. The Project is, therefore, not expected to induce population growth due to an in-migration of jobseekers. No population-driven changes to community composition or pressure on infrastructure and services in Wheatland County or surrounding communities are expected. Any increase in workers in the area is expected to be minimal and temporary in nature.	Section 15.1 of the DPD
37	Need for any further social and economic information to be disaggregated by identity factors (e.g., by sex/gender, age and ethnicity) to identify gaps or inequities among diverse group of the population. Proponent should ensure that GBA+ is applied throughout the impact assessment process.	Social and economic information has been disaggregated by sex and Indigeneity in Section 15.	Section 15 of the DPD

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
38	Provide specific strategies to increase hiring of Indigenous community members as well as other vulnerable groups (i.e., women, visible minorities and persons with disabilities).	<p>The Proponent is currently engaging with Indigenous Groups and will consider a potential Letter of Intent for Indigenous Groups that are willing to commit their members to commute to Calgary. Currently, the Proponent is focusing on local (Calgary-based) Indigenous programming organizations but are open to other opportunities as they present themselves.</p> <p>The Proponent has engaged with Community Futures Treaty 7, a delivery partner for ISET programming, to explore partnership opportunities for training and employment with local Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>At this time, there are no 'preferential' hire groups, however the Proponent is always looking to partner with organizations representing broader labour pools, especially those who look to promote those under-represented in the workforce, to provide paths to employment in their industry.</p> <p>As the Proponent moves towards becoming a consolidated organization, it will become federally regulated and will therefore collect additional data on their workforce demographics such as Indigenous participation. By early 2024, the Proponent will measure its workforce against the demographics of its employment areas and will set targets to reach similar proportions. At such time that gaps have been identified, strategies for each group will be developed and implemented. Currently the Proponent has initiated contact with women's groups and other training initiatives to prepare for anticipated training opportunities.</p>	Section 15.3 and Section 22.3 of the DPD
39	Recommend cultural sensitivity training for the whole workforce and plans to ensure safety of Indigenous peoples involved with the Project given concern regarding bias towards Indigenous peoples.	The Proponent is engaging with Levvel Consulting to explore potential partnerships including skills training for new entrants to the aerospace industry as well as existing employee cultural training initiatives.	Section 22.3 of the DPD
Water – Groundwater and Surface Water			
40	Clarify which water sources are anticipated to be affected by the Project and how potential effects will be addressed.	There are no waterbodies or watercourses expected to be affected by the Project. There are no watercourses or waterbodies on the Project site. The Proponent does not plan to withdraw water from a waterbody or watercourse as the preferred water supply option is through the East Calgary Regional Waterline (Section 12.2.3), nor are there plans to discharge water off-site, except potentially in the form of off-site irrigation to agricultural fields (Section 12.2.5).	Section 12.2.3 and Section 12.2.5 of the DPD
41	Consider potential effects to water quality due to surface water runoff.	<p>The Proponent does not anticipate any potential effects to water quality due to surface water runoff. Surface water runoff from the site will be collected in a storm ponds and ditches as shown in Figure 2. Five methods of stormwater management have been considered for the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaporation from stormwater ponds (zero discharge) • On-site irrigation or off-site irrigation to neighbouring agricultural fields from stormwater ponds • Mechanical evaporation from stormwater ponds • Constructing a force-main to the Co-operative Stormwater Management Initiative regional stormwater management system (a municipal system) • Constructing a force-main to the Weed Lake Ditch <p>The final method of stormwater management will be determined at the subdivision stage. The currently preferred option is a zero-discharge stormwater pond system managed by evaporation and irrigation of both onsite and potentially offsite lands (agricultural fields). Stormwater systems are regulated through an Alberta Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act approval and an Alberta Water Act approval. The system will be designed to meet the Wheatland County Design and Construction Standards Manual (2016), Alberta Environment Stormwater Management Guidelines, and the City of Calgary Stormwater Management and Design Manual (2011), where applicable.</p>	Figure 2 and Section 12.2.5 of the DPD
Wetlands			
42	Recommend providing additional information on what mitigation measures will be taken to offset permanent wetland loss due to the construction of the Project, such as wetland restoration and/or compensation.	The Proponent is applying for <i>Water Act</i> approval to disturb wetlands and ephemeral waterbodies at the Project site. As per Alberta Wetland Policy requirements, the Proponent must mitigate permanent wetland loss. The Proponent is proposing provision of in-lieu payment to Alberta Environment and Protected Areas (AEPA) to remove permanent and temporary wetlands, based on the wetland's relative value score, for the construction, restoration, or enhancement of a wetland within the same watershed. The final form of mitigation will eventually be decided by AEPA.	Section 19.1 of the DPD
Other - Editorial Comments on the Initial Project Description			
43	Clarify distance of Siksika Reserve No. 146 from the Project.	The location of the Project in relation to Siksika reserve No. 146 is confirmed to be 23 km. The distances have been corrected to be consistent throughout the DPD.	Section 15.1 of the DPD
44	Update Table 5 to include a holistic list of federal reserve lands.	Table 5 has been updated to include the federal reserve lands listed under part e): Tsuut'ina Nation 145, Stoney Nakoda Nation 142, 142B, 143 and 144, and Eden Valley 216.	Section 13 and Table 5 of the DPD

Issue No.	Issue Topics	Response	Reference
45	Proponent should verify that the greenhouse gas emissions in Appendix I, Table 15 are accurate.	<p>The calculations have gone through a secondary internal review. The following adjustments have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Heating: There was an error in the GHG calculations for the years 2039 to 2042, where the emissions showed an increase in 2039. The error has been corrected. • Land Use: Land use clearing emissions have been updated to make them more consistent with the SACC guidance. They are now reported separately. • Construction: We have updated the construction emissions to be consistent with the methodologies we have used for other recent projects. <p>The values in the Climate Change Analysis (Table 15 in Appendix M) have been revised accordingly.</p>	Table 15 in Appendix M
46	Need for clarification on the preliminary spatial boundaries of the Project (i.e., regional study area, local study area, and Project study area) and the rationale for the boundaries of these areas.	<p>Based on the nature of the Project and the low potential for environmental risks and health risks associated with its construction and operation, the only study area set to date has been the noise assessment study area (Appendix G). The Study Area for the Project noise assessment was established as a 1.5 km buffer on the Project boundary. Potential noise receptors were initially identified using publicly available satellite imagery. Noise receptors were subsequently verified by WSP during a site visit in late November 2022. A total of 36 noise receptors were identified within the Study Area and treated as receptors in Project noise assessment, including occupied dwellings and other areas of interest to local stakeholders.</p> <p>If in the future, there is requirement for the Proponent to assess other potential effects, appropriate study areas will be established.</p>	Appendix G
47	Recommend that the Proponent engage with the Indigenous Skills and Employment Training (ISET) service delivery providers throughout the project, sharing the scope and details pertaining to the Project activities (e.g., type and number of jobs, timelines, and any other relevant information) with ISET agreement holders, so that training partners can work to prepare their clients to be ready to access these jobs.	The Proponent has engaged with Community Futures Treaty 7, a delivery partner for ISET programming, to explore partnership opportunities for training and employment with local Indigenous Groups.	Section 22.3 of the DPD