

-----Original Message-----

From: Nadine Beckham <contact information removed>

Sent: July 19, 2016 2:45 PM

To: EA Review / Examen EE (CEAA)

Subject: comments on terms of reference

Hi,

I have attended many public meetings on environmental assessments for projects that are local, provincial, and national.

What I find problematic in all these meetings is the proponents ability to use job creation, taxes to be paid, and rising costs of projects to counter any negative comments regarding the environmental impacts.

Generally speaking these values are enhanced, or not well known at the time of the assessment and are down graded once the project receives approval. They are not garenteed through the life of the project and no over site is required to ensure the project is producing these benefits.

Terms of Reference for any project requiring an EA must NOT include the Social/Economic impact

The size of a project should not be the trigger for an EA. The requirement for an EA should be based upon the projects need to exploited the natural environment.

We tend to concentrate these assessments around the development of energy for export and resources from mining and ignore the development of fish farms on the ocean, damming of rivers and draining of wet lands.

Many of these latter projects being consider as small scale therefore not triggering an EA. All which have potential for large scale damage to the natural environment.

Terms of Reference should include that an EA can be triggered for any project of any size that requires the exploitation of the natural environment.

Anther area of major concern for me is the Terms of Reference for projects do not include all impacts from the building, to transport, to consumption, and disposal of the product being developed.

Northern Gate Way being an excellent example of a project that did not have to include all impacts. The public was confused about what they were to comment on as it was never about the development of the bitumen but about whether that bitumen would be better off in a pipe then on a train. The public opposed the project on much more then how and where it should be transported to the coast, but the upstream down stream impacts were not included in the Terms of Reference and therefore could be ignore in the approval process.

Terms of Reference for all projects requiring an EA must include all potential impacts from breaking ground to disposal of said product.

In British Columbia we were told by the present government that large scale dam projects were detrimental to the environment and therefore we should embrace the development of Independent Power Projects IPP (specifically Run of River projects) as they are small scale in nature meaning less invasive to the environment. These projects were allowed to forgo an EA if they stayed below a specific

output of power. Please take a look at how many rivers in BC have now been put into pipes without an EA.

The Site C Dam was given an EA ticket in absents of any consideration of what was already approved to ensure we wouldn't build a Site C style Dam.

Terms of Reference should include Investigation into policies in place which contradict a future development.

(If this was in place then Site C would never have gotten to an EA, and since it has all future Run of River project approvals should be voided)

I am amazed that we focus on globalization but don't have a national energy policy, no provincial free trade agreement and no policy that says Canada first and export second. Any project that requires an EA should have to include in it's Terms of Reference how it can decrease the environmental impacts of past practices not just how it will attempt to mitigate it's new negative impacts. An example of this would be importing and exporting oil product.

Terms of Reference for all projects should include what potential improvements to the Canadian environment can be achieved.

I believe this is an incredibly important process for the Federal Government to undertake and I am hopeful that we will remember to think locally as this will ensure that we are kind to the environment in which we live and share equally with all other life.

Don't cut us any slack as we will take it. We will, however, rise to the level of expectation so make sure we are expected to rise to the highest level. Please remember it is not our job to ensure a projects profit it is the proponents job to ensure it doesn't diminish access to clean air, water, and food for all.

Nadine Beckham