



ANALYSIS

## Overhaul of B.C. environmental assessment will fail: scientists

JUSTINE HUNTER &gt;

PUBLISHED NOVEMBER 19, 2018

UPDATED 2 HOURS AGO

FOR SUBSCRIBERS



COMMENTS

The B.C. government's overhaul of its environmental assessment regime is in danger of failing to accomplish what it promises – to restore public confidence in the way government manages natural resources, and to protect the environment.

That conclusion comes from a group of independent academic environmental scientists who have torn apart the proposed new Environmental Assessment Act that was tabled earlier this month.

It's a further hit for a government that has taken more than a few on its green credentials.

Environment Minister George Heyman tabled the new act to replace a set of rules written by the B.C. Liberal government in 2002. The legislation promises to speed up the approval process by ensuring that potential hurdles are identified early. For the first time, climate change will be considered in decision-making under the proposed law, and it adopts a higher level of consultation with Indigenous communities.

In an essay released Thursday, the Environment Minister said his new measures "will restore the public's trust in the way government manages our natural resources," with a "strong and transparent environmental-assessment process, based on science."

But scientists from the province's top research universities disagree.

What the bill fails to do is fix fundamental flaws that exist in B.C.'s environmental-assessment process today, say the more than 180 university academics and science professionals who have signed the letter that will be sent on Monday to Premier John Horgan.

"We are concerned that the proposed process lacks scientific rigour, with significant consequences for the health and environment of all British Columbians," they wrote. "The continued lack of scientific independence, peer review, and transparency in the evaluation of a given project's risk to the environment will serve only to further undermine public confidence."

They remind the Premier that the public expects a robust system to protect the environment, to ensure B.C. doesn't see another disaster like the one at the Mount Polley mine. In 2014, the tailings pond at the mine breached, spilling approximately 25 million cubic metres of waste water and tailings into nearby water systems and lakes in central British Columbia. An expert panel concluded that the failure of the dam was a preventable accident due to a flawed dam design.

Beyond Mount Polley, the B.C. environmental-assessment process has come under fire for projects that failed to pass a federal environmental assessment. When the B.C. government approved the Prosperity mine proposal – a project that would have drained a lake and used it to store waste rock – the federal review concluded that the mine would have a “high-magnitude, long-term and irreversible effect” on the environment. With B.C.'s blessing, the proponents revised the project and reapplied, and again, the federal review found that the development would result in significant adverse environmental effects on water quality, fish and wetland ecosystems.

STORY CONTINUES BELOW ADVERTISEMENT

STORY CONTINUES BELOW ADVERTISEMENT



B.C.'s approval of the Pacific Northwest LNG project, a proposed liquefied natural gas facility on Lelu Island near Prince Rupert is another example that undermined public trust, said Simon Fraser University scientist Michael Price, one of the authors of the letter to the Premier. Both B.C. and Canada initially accepted a proponent's report suggesting that the facility would not threaten juvenile-salmon habitat in the surrounding estuary.

“We’re talking about Canada’s second-largest sockeye salmon producing system, and the proponent’s consultant couldn’t find fish,” he noted. “There was a bias in the information collected, and then you end up with a bias in the evaluation.”

The federal review took three years and the proponents were forced to make costly amendments, before approval was granted by Ottawa. The backers have since walked away from the proposal.

The proposed B.C. Environmental Assessment Act will be called for debate on Tuesday. The concerned scientists propose three amendments: Rather than relying on project proponents, information used to assess risk should be collected, and interpreted, independently. Evidence should be subject to independent peer review, at arm’s length from government. And the data used in decision-making should be made public.

“Otherwise, we will continue to have a lack of public trust,” Mr. Price said in an interview.

The minority NDP government, which holds power with the support of the Green Party as a champion on the environment. But, from the approval of the Site C dam and a massive LNG facility, to the continuance of logging old-growth forests and open-net fish farming, the New Democrats have not veered wildly from the path laid down by the Liberals.

STORY CONTINUES BELOW ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. Heyman has indicated it will take a full year to implement all the regulations associated with his new Environmental Assessment Act. There is time to make changes, if he wants to.

FOLLOW JUSTINE HUNTER ON TWITTER @JUSTINE\_HUNTER

REPORT AN ERROR EDITORIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

COMMENTS

Welcome to The Globe and Mail's comment community. This is a space where subscribers can engage with each other and Globe staff.

We aim to create a safe and valuable space for discussion and debate. That means:

- All comments will be reviewed by one or more moderators before being posted to the site. This should only take a few moments.
- Treat others as you wish to be treated
- Criticize ideas, not people
- Stay on topic
- Avoid the use of toxic and offensive language
- Flag bad behaviour

Comments that violate our community guidelines will be removed. Commenters who repeatedly violate community guidelines may be suspended, causing them to temporarily lose their ability to engage with comments.

[Read our community guidelines here](#)

Comments

Post a comment

1200 characters remaining

Off Topic

Post

ALL COMMENTS 3

VIEWING OPTIONS

Ron Jakimchuk 1 hour ago

The 3 amendments proposed seem reasonable, except that project proponents should also provide input of data and assessment as well as a totally independent interpretation. This would serve to add value and rigor to assessments. Implementation of revisions should not take a year. This is a tiresome excuse for "kicking the can" down the road. Politicians claim they are eager to govern until they are in a position to do so. The examples cited in the article are evidence of this. This sorry record crosses all political parties.

RESPECT REPLY

SHARE REPORT

BC Thoughts 3 hours ago

Despite the most rigorous standards and engineering not all risk can be eliminated.

In total billions of dollars have been spent over many decades in the design of automobile. Despite all of the very effective devices now incorporated into a vehicle we have not been able to eliminate death in auto accidents.

Most people are familiar with autos while they are not familiar with the risks associated with the decisions and risks in other areas.

RESPECT 1 REPLY

SHARE REPORT

**Snowaway** 5 hours ago

"from the approval of the Site C dam and a massive LNG facility, to the continuance of logging old-growth forests and open-net fish farming, the New Democrats have not veered wildly from the path laid down by the Liberals." But Horgan and Weaver signal virtue by objecting to the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion - as it costs BC very little and costs Alberta very much. BC hypocrisy is alive and well.

RESPECT 9 REPLY

SHARE REPORT

Read [most recent letters to the editor](#).

**RELATED**

B.C. Housing Minister says high-end house prices dropping, no relief at lower levels

Western Canada: Oil companies urge Alberta to cut output as crude prices continue to squeeze province

Two dozen children died of drug overdoses last year, says B.C. children's watchdog

**NEXT STORY**

Nov. 19: Free trade with China. Plus other letters to the editor

Canada needs leadership to address our oil patch crisis

Globe editorial: Doug Ford wants to bring back cash-for-access fundraising. It could cost him dearly



St. Michael's principal explains delay in police report of alleged sexual assault



Politics Briefing: accusation of breaking election rules



**TRENDING**

---

- 1 A Viola Desmond primer: Who's the woman on today's new Canadian \$10 bill?

---

- 2 Liberals and NDP accuse Conservatives of skirting election laws


---

- 3 Canada's brain-injured Cuba diplomats speak out about Ottawa's silence

---

- 4 Six things you need to know today about managing your money

---

- 5 Gordon Pape's mailbag: Buying REITs in December, TFSA woes, RRIF strategies and more 

[TERMS & CONDITIONS](#) [COMMUNITY GUIDELINES](#) [PRIVACY POLICY](#) [DISCLAIMER](#)

---

**SUBSCRIBE**

**BUSINESS SERVICES**

**CONTACT US**

**READER SERVICES**

---

**ABOUT US**

© Copyright 2018 The Globe and Mail Inc. All rights reserved.

351 King Street East, Suite 1600, Toronto, ON Canada, M5A 0N1

Phillip Crawley, Publisher

