

From: Stan Proboszcz <contact information removed>
Sent: July 20, 2016 6:42 PM
To: EA Review / Examen EE (CEAA)
Subject: Comments re: EA TOR

Hello,

Some comments on the EA TOR.

Within the context of the existing core questions, the panel should be directed to specifically consider:

- How should the scope of the project to be assessed and the scope of the assessment be determined, including the factors to be assessed and the breadth of the definition of environmental effects of a project?
- How should the conditions for approval of a project determined, monitored and enforced?
- How should the final decision and the reasons for that decision, including the weight given to opposing evidence, be communicated to stakeholders?

Further, it is not sufficient for the panel to consider how to require project advocates to choose the best technologies available to reduce environmental impacts; the panel should also be directed to consider how to require project advocates to consider the need for the project and alternatives to the project.

In considering how to ensure decisions are based on science, facts and evidence and serve the public's interest, the panel should be directed to specifically address approaches to be used to overcome potential bias/conflict of interest.

The panel should also expressly consider how to best achieve inter-jurisdictional harmonization leading to a single comprehensive EA process to provide the basis for decision making at all levels.

The timeline for the panel's work is very short. To allow for informed participation in the compressed timeline, the criteria for participant funding should be set out in the terms of reference, and the details of how to access participant funding should be released immediately, with funding made available to participants at least 30 days prior to commencement of opportunities to engage with the panel.

Stan Proboszcz

Watershed Watch Salmon Society