

From: Jenifer Hill <email address removed>

Sent: June 21, 2016 8:25 PM

To: EA Review / Examen EE (CEAA)

Subject: Comments on Environmental Assessment Review Panel Terms of Reference

To whom it may concern,

I am an environmental consultant and have conducted impact assessments under CEAA for many BC mining projects. I would like the following to be considered in revisions to the Expert Panel's Terms of Reference for the Review of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Process:

- The cumulative effects assessment requirements in CEAA require revision. To be effective, cumulative effects need to be assessed at a regional land use planning level rather than at the project level. Project proponents do not have access to the necessary information, nor resources, nor the correct perspective to conduct cumulative effects. By all means cumulative effects should be conducted, but the panel should review whether this is the appropriate legislative tool to be used, whether this is the correct scale for assessment, and who should be conducting cumulative effects assessments.
- The panel needs to consider investor confidence, transparency, certainty, and timelines in their review. A long, onerously detailed, and uncertain assessment process does not lead to better decisions and may result in investors taking their money elsewhere.
- In reviewing the requirement for use of best technology, there must be consideration of technical and economic feasibility of the technology for each application, and the level of uncertainty of the technology. In addition, what may be considered best technology today may not be best technology tomorrow or may just be the flavour of the day. I refer you to the example of the addition of lead to gasoline which was best technology at one time. Another example is the dry stack tailings being pushed as best technology in BC; however, dry stack is not "best technology" in all applications and the push for long-term physical stability is shadowing the equally important need for long-term chemical stability. This may come to haunt us later.
- The objective of reviewing the environmental assessment process to ensure decisions are science and fact-based should be clarified. Science always has uncertainty (especially with dynamic, open, environmental systems), and facts are often subjective depending on how they are presented. Also, there is concern that the amount of science requested of proponents will become prohibitively onerous and impractical. There are practical ways to effectively manage project activities that minimize environmental impacts, even with scientific uncertainty.
- The panel should also review ways to improve the communication of questions and responses. Currently, proponents get mired in questions and answers and there is little way for the public to follow the lines of questions and answers through the process.
- The panel should also review the information required to be submitted for an environmental assessment. The documents are too large to read and review. I suggest the panel review other

high income nation's processes for alternate ideas. For example, the Environmental Impact Statements produced in the USA are focused and usually one or two volumes that can be easily read.

I am fully supportive of the review of the environmental assessment process and look forward to the results of the panel's review.

Regards,

Jenifer Hill, M.Sc., R.P.Bio.

<personal information removed> BC

<personal information removed>