

Comments received at ea.revitalization@gov.bc.ca regarding proposed changes to B.C.'s environmental assessment process between June 18th and July 30th. Personal information has been removed from the comments to protect privacy. An additional 445 emails were received that were not relevant to the discussion paper – they have not been published.

Be very specific I.e. More input from citizens- too vague! 10 more? 10,000 more? encourage party membership to register a vote.

Hold a Rally ? Mailout draft copies of proposed review processes with voting forms? Public meetings, with same access. get some teeth in the review processes, specific timing, specific goals.

=====

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on BC's environmental assessments.

I support a major overhaul to BC's environmental reviews as proposed by our current government. In particular, I support the following:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I urge our leaders in the government to be far more responsible regarding BC's climate targets. In doing so, reject projects that jeopardize our environment including climate targets. Projects should undergo rigorous examination and actually be reviewed. Listen to First Nations and collaborate with them, include scientists, and citizens who have for a long time warned us of the danger we are already in if we don't divest from fossil fuel projects. Especially now, absolutely reject projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent.

=====

Please create regulations that take impact statements seriously, that set clear targets over which not to exceed (targets on GHGs, on water quality, on habitat protection, human health outcomes, etc. depending on the nature of the impact). Please ensure cumulative impacts are examined. Please avoid the language of 'balance' is justification for economic goals that strip environmental values. I work in local government and I know that we use this language of 'balancing interests' to justify poorer environmental outcomes than what is possible, when really we should be recognizing that the 'balance' for too long was tipped against environmental protection. Please include regulations that enshrine the genuine (intrinsic and utilitarian) wealth that functioning ecosystems provide.

=====

I believe that we need to be paying more attention to what our scientists tell us, and less attention to industry and industry's self serving plans for development.

I also am fully in support of holding any development up at a strong review, and ensuring no environmental damage is at all likely to occur. And importantly that our province bear in mind the very clear global climate warming that is taking place, and not encourage any development that adds to this.

I support our provincial government in its efforts to protect the province, and in fact the global environment and I hope to see consultations with educated wildlife and environmental scientists built into the legislation. No more watering down of environmental protections through weak legislation!

=====

This is an excellent opportunity for B.C. to fix the current, weak review system.

An improved review system would ensure more projects are actually reviewed and would prioritize collaboration with First Nations to lead joint assessments. Reviews should be based on science, and I would like to see more input from independent scientists in the process. It is essential that projects be rejected if they prevent us from reaching our provincial climate targets, and they should be automatically rejected if they fail to secure the consent of First Nations.

=====

The changes that I want are:

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed, Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments, More input from citizens and independent scientists, Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets and Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

Please ensure to include in the environmental assessment revitalization mandatory environmental review on all projects, independent monitoring, regular government inspections, inclusion of citizens and independent scientists input as that of First Nations.

=====

When a proponent wishes to engage in resource extraction in BC we must require:

- 1) that they do a realistic risk assessment for worst-case scenario potentialities, and
- 2) that they have a practical workable plan to ensure that measures are in place to prevent the worst-case scenario from becoming reality, and
- 3) that contingency funds are in place that are sufficient to fully rectify the situation should the worst-case scenario become reality, and
- 4) that said contingency funds be placed in a trust that is not accessible to the proponent or its agents until such time that conditions are restored to a state where there is no longer a risk, and
- 5) that risk assessment be conducted by an agency completely independent of and unbeholding to the proponent.

=====

I would like to see some independence in the review of all projects. Big business should absolutely not be allowed to influence any of the parties involved through any kind of financial incentive. First Nations need to be consulted and they should all have independent help in doing this. Big companies should not be allowed to give any shares/incentives/bribes of any shape or form to any of the parties involved in any project e.g. a First Nations tribal member or employee should never receive any kind of 'gift' or compensation whilst projects are being reviewed - buying acceptance of a project should be absolutely banned. Government should not feel pressured or bribed in any way to accept projects, more should be reviewed. There should be fair more public consultation of the broader BC population and also the areas closest and most impacted by any project. Scientists should be given equal weight to the economists and they should be independent. First Nations must approve of any project but even if they do and the science shows it is not a good thing for BC the project should be rejected. The big environmental firms should be policed more and their work reviewed in absolute detail - sloppy work and mistakes must not be allowed.

=====

I ask that this government start NOW to make a difference in how they are handling their research on matters of extreme importance for the future of our land and waterways. Please listen to people who will live here now and in the future. Big Business needs to be only Part of the equation and not all or Most of decision making. First Nations, Independent scientists, Informed citizens all need to be represented when there is a major change to our lives and the life of the nature all around this Beautiful world and my home!

=====

It is wonderful to have a decent, fair government again, after so many years of governments with an allegiance to isolated decisions with very little environmental understanding.

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes. Early engagement, meaningful public participation and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

However, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and

- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

=====

We need to make sure that all projects pass a climate test. Long-term sustainability means we can't keep approving projects that lock in decades of greenhouse gas emissions. It's important that we be concerned about climate change and the effect it is having on humans and animals.

=====

B.C. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT INPUT

My thoughts regarding an environmental assessment program for BC are this:

I am not sure how far you intend to take this, but I believe that the Assessment should be based on the premise that people are entitled to a healthy level of air quality and drinking water—even in their homes, whether it be a single family home or a multiunit home where one's habit i.e. cigarette smoking, marijuana use or even so called perfumed air sprays or plug-ins can be felt as noxious to others and can thus effect the quality of air of a person's home. Obviously a person cannot be prevented from smoking etc. in their own home but if that is the case there must be a way of ameliorating that—like a built in air purifier, or a designated smoking room.

BC needs to have our own Environmental Assessment program, separate and apart from the Federal program.

The environmental assessment would be required to be done by scientists familiar with the area that is being assessed who are 'independent'.

The decisions would be based on 'best practices' and made by scientists that are not affiliated with the industry per se—i.e. not lobbyist or scientists who have a financial or other interests that could slant their decision making --AND definitely not politicians. The decisions should be based on the best interests of our environment and the best interests of the people of BC.

When there are questions as to what are the best practices, or conflicting points of view—it would be wonderful if the EA could do ethical research that could add to the body of work. This would ideally be part of their mandate. It would also be ideal if any research that involve people per se would take into consideration the difference between men and women—and not just focus on men as so much past research .

The oversight for any environmental requirements would be done by an independent third party NOT politicians or people of that industry or anyone who would have a conflict of interest i.e. mine inspections done to see if the mine is keeping up its standards would not be done by an owner or employee of the mine. It might be an idea to have it as a Crown Corporation (that could be a little too complicated, though—just a thought).

Ideally when there is a new project proposed in a community it would great for the community to have early meaningful updates (not just spin) and input into that project.

Where there is a conflict or opposition to a project—i.e. when a community is vehemently opposed to a project ideally the people of the community would have a say about this-- not just the elected officials, because sometimes the elected officials can only see one side of it.

I don't have a suggestion about how to do this but I believe it is vitally important that the BC Environmental Assessment program has a mechanism whereby a community can have a say if there is a conflict or vehement opposition to a project (like where fracking is involved in Squamish, or like bringing contaminated soil to a Cowichan watershed)—there needs to be a mechanism where the community can be heard. This would apply whether it is two groups in a community with opposing ideas, goals or plans; or whether it is the community versus a level of government. There needs to be some way form of mediation, or conflict or dispute resolution. Hopefully this can be done earlier in the process so a company or group doesn't spend a lot of money and resources in a project—and before the community has to take a case to court.

The environment- including green space for people would be considered just as important as jobs and money

As we work our way through the issues related to First Nations rights and responsibilities and entitlements I believe there will also be a need to have this similar form of mediation or dispute resolution where both indigenous and non-indigenous communities can be heard if there are conflicts --but in a manner that both groups can grow and thrive, and feel respected and heard and perhaps in the end learn from one another.

I do believe that we need to protect our water supplies. That should be our upmost goal. This would mean that watersheds would be completely protected—no dumping of contaminated soil and no placing of pipelines carrying toxic substances or logging should be considered—ever.

Finally, I am not sure if this is in the purview of the environmental assessment program but I would like to see all BC cities, municipalities, districts, companies and the province etc. to be required to draw up and institute a wild life plan when a large area of forested or wild land is going to be destroyed for development. This would mean these entities would be required to provide and institute a plan to move and provide adequate habitat for those animals that are going to be displaced and do so in a safe and gentle manner.

=====

As a scientist with a deep background in many varied aspects of Biology, I concur with the inclusion of many of the items on the list of changes currently contemplated for environmental reviews. Hence, it is very gratifying to see that among what is being considered are input from independent scientists, close adherence to climate targets, seeking collaborations with, & gaining the consent of First Nations peoples & of other stakeholders.

I would, nevertheless, urge even more focus on a big picture environmental outlook. When we couple our understanding of Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) with that of Ecocide (terrible disruptions to, & losses of, critical ecosystems & biodiversity, including rates of extinction up to 1,000 times faster than in pre-human history) now underway, & with the depletions of critical resources driven by the human population explosion, we will quickly appreciate that we are taking unbelievably high risks with the “Life-Support” systems & sub-systems that allow us to actually exist on planet Earth. This is not a sane way to manage all the myriad aspects of our civilization. My rationale here is grounded upon an appropriately calibrated level of concern that is educed from an intelligent, sane, rational, reasoned, & practical assessment of available information. Indeed, I am a member of the “Alliance of World Scientists” & one of the thousands of signatories to the “World Scientists’ Warning to Humanity: A Second Notice” that has been circulating over the last year.

Hence, I urge all BC residents, government & public members alike, to recognize & to understand the very real existential threats that we now, as a global community, face.

Within our own borders, for example, look not only at the ever increasing frequency of heat waves & forest fires but also at the widening scope of such disruptive changes. For example, look at how many times Fort Nelson, way up in the North East, hits over 300C every summer & you will get a sense of how dangerously close we may be to setting off unstoppable feedback loops involving carbon emissions from destabilized peat & permafrost, situations that would spell unmitigated disaster. If, conversely, we step back from just what is happening in our neck of the woods & look beyond our shores & borders, it quickly becomes evident that huge segments of the world are literally on fire &/or baking under unrelenting heat waves forced into stationary place by “heat domes”. A global outlook is not only informative & useful but decidedly necessary.

But, yet, to the extent that public discussions on mega projects are even considered, much less executed, very little attention is given to bigger world views, other than perhaps tangential references to climate targets. Indeed, such “dialogs” are decidedly parochial & skewed to very narrow interests such that very little truly meaningful information is disseminated. The Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain (KM) expansion debacle is an almost perfect prism thru which to highlight this very dangerous trend. Throughout the entire KM “discussion”, the Canadian public has simply been, & is continuing to be, subjected to a campaign of disinformation & misinformation founded on strategies that are very typical of the Big Oil Playbook (itself fashioned after Big Tobacco’s own practices). The terrible dangers we’re facing by continuing to fail to adequately & quickly address Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) are simply the tip of the veritable iceberg. When we do a proper accounting of all the various types of pollutions we’re already creating with Business as Usual (BAU) attitudes & policies, we find that the so-called “Carbon Budget” upon which the 2015 Paris Accord was framed, is already actually smaller than we’d hoped. Particularly worrisome is how dangerously close we already are to all manner of tipping points that could unleash many different forms of naturally sequestered carbon such as methane hydrates, permafrost methane, peat-trapped methane, lignin trapped in trees that’s released in forest fires etc etc. So we already have a very tiny, & rapidly shrinking pollution budget (that could itself quickly be burst by these feedback mechanisms), one which we should be singularly devoting to a very rapid transition away from dirty energy, BAU economies. Instead, we’re wasting & squandering that tiny pollution budget on gigantically wasteful & economically unviable mega projects such as KM. How many in the Canadian populace are even aware of these hard realities?

As human activities continue to assail the world’s natural systems & resources, planetary conditions keep deviating from the equilibria underpinning the essential “Life-Support” systems & sub-systems that have collectively & synergistically sustained the biosphere & therefore, human life. Such deviations & disruptions can lead to dangerously increased chances of extreme, catastrophic potentialities. Good decision making processes and systems are informed and guided by sound scientific information & evidence. Any relevant, responsible evaluations on managing our natural resources must maintain, at their core, cognizance that life as we know it depends, among other things, on natural systems for clean, breathable air, clean water, reliable rainfall patterns, and temperature and climate stability. Risk assessment analysis for highly polluting practices are always challenging but when such proposals attempt to insert themselves into highly chaotic & complex ecosystems (such as our coastal waters & the oceans in general), the stakes become ever more elevated, demanding that we exercise even greater caution to limit the potentially grave risks of unexpected repercussions. Such complications become even more pronounced with the extremely disruptive forces at play from AGW & Ecocide.

Hence, it should be self-evident that for us to survive, planetary “Life-Support” systems must remain as close to those that have existed for the millennia during which humans have thrived. Preserving such systems requires that we always exercise great caution in how we “manage” the natural world because

unexpected repercussions to the highly chaotic & complex ecosystems involved are frighteningly common. For example, our understanding of trophic cascades & trophic downgrading etc is still evolving but we know enough to recognize that disruptions to key populations, such as many of the whale species we seek to protect within our waters, are particularly impactful and unpredictable.

One of the greatest challenges to informed discourse on all of these issues derives from how most people simply do not have easy access to relevant information. For example, the sheer size of our oceans leaves many people oblivious and inured to the ever-deteriorating conditions of the oceanic component of the planet's hydrosphere, a key part of the systems that are collectively critical for supporting life. There is so very much going on, & we understand good parts of it, but only in broad strokes, so it is best for us all to keep all critical planetary systems as healthy as we can, in conditions that are as close to what has worked well for us. As we keep deviating further away from those conditions, we simply will struggle to keep up with the way Nature responds to these deviations.

I am very convinced that if more people truly understood the exigent existential imperatives at play here, the world would very quickly come together as one to initiate and deploy "war-footing" national & international mobilization measures to keep this planet Earth, our only home, viable for human life. Sadly, it is clear that only highly informed but vanishingly small segments of the world's populace truly understand that unless we keep our "Life-Support" systems vibrant and healthy, rapid changes, especially in microbial ecosystems, could have very dangerous consequences. Given this societal information deficit, your government, working in concert with other leaders, must step up, and take decisive actions to correct our current course & to help navigate the ship of human civilization into calmer, safer waters.

=====

It is time our government put in place environmental assessments that reflect humanity's reliance on a healthy environment. Climate change needs to be front and center when assessing any kind of project. Our province needs to dramatically increase the speed with which this is addressed. We are already experiencing the effects of climate chaos.

The role of the government to protect the well being of it's citizens first and foremost, before the bottom line of corporations, needs to made clear by the regulations that are adopted. In no way do I feel that is the case now! It seems money and profits take priority in most cases. This is not OK...

We also need to respect and the use science and critical thinking to evaluate projects. Right now, again. money seems to hold more sway than facts. Decisions need to be based on science and facts informed by our values and what we really want. I want a healthy environment that is treated with the respect it needs and deserves. I want decisions made with fairness and justice for First Nations, I want our government to honour our agreements with them. So far our government has been acting dishonourably towards us and First Nations.

I want decisions to be open and transparent with clear indications how they are meeting the above goals. The decision on the Ste C Dam shows blatant disregard for these principles and is not acceptable.

Companies need to pay the true costs of the project and be held liable for any damage the cause. This liability needs to be covered by insurance or a fund the have to put aside in advance that that is under the control of a third party. Again money seems to trump fairness and justice right now.

In conclusion, our government needs to do what is right. I am so tired of pretty words and terrible actions. My faith in an honest, fair government is pretty low right now. I will be

evaluating who you actually work for by the decisions you make in this process, your citizens or to put it simply, money. It seems, right now that the ones you listen to are the ones with money.

=====

I am sitting here in disbelief that the Jumbo Resort Development has been given the go ahead despite the loud and clear opposition by so many locals looking to defend this sacred area.

In future I would hope that any new projects are considered case by case. As you reform our environmental assessment process I hope you will read my recommendations:

- 1) Consideration for the environment, local peoples, local animals and ecosystems should be top of the list when considering any new project.
- 2) UNDRIP principles should be adhered to.
- 3) Listen to the public when attending public meetings. Thousands are against this development, if you'd taken the time to visit or attend even one of the many rallies, you would understand the opposition.
- 4) Visit the places you are thinking of developing - anyone who goes to Jumbo is horrified that it will be developed (except of course those who will profit from its demise).
- 5) Climate test all projects - what are the future implications of the project?
- 6) Consider independent scientific data (not just the data provided by the proponents or project developers).

I am deeply disappointed at this decision. I applaud all of those who will show up to protest it.

=====

I've only been in BC for a couple of years, but I have been very impressed by the environmental ethic that seems to be so strong in the province. I think that a dissonance between the general public and the previous government around this issue was a primary reason why we have a new government today. This is why the environmental assessment process in BC needs to reflect the high standards of its citizens on the issue.

BC fosters some of the best intellectual institutions in the world, and yet, independent evidence and oversight of environmental assessments is not a requirement. If you want to call a review scientific, this is a requirement: independent researchers need to be able to review the work of other researchers and carry out the same procedures to compare results. It says something about the character of any researcher who is against this principle. Please legally require independent evidence and oversight of environmental assessments. Independent peer review of evidence and assessments, as well as a process to make such reviews communicable to the public would also be great steps forward.

Also, without such reviews, it is difficult to see how consultation with indigenous groups can be adequately achieved: If reviews are not understandably presented, and if information about a project is not independently verified, how can full consultation about that project occur?

Similarly, the impact that a given project will have on the sustainability of the province requires an independent review for a confident estimation.

Provincially, I think we can move toward embodying primary values of BC citizens; namely, the environmental ethic, the scientific rigor, and the public participation for which individuals in this province are admired.

Please, legally require independent evidence and oversight of assessments to bring us closer to that realization.

=====

Environmental assessment is an extremely important component of government efforts to use law to help protect our environment. I congratulate the initial efforts being taken to improve the process, including giving more of a role for First Nations to be included. I want to stress a stronger range of improvements are needed, in line with the document "Achieving sustainability: A vision for next-generation environmental assessment in British Columbia" signed by key civil society organizations from across environmental and social justice sectors, such as Amnesty International Canada, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, the Fair Mining Collaborative, and West Coast Environmental Law Association. These are organizations which routinely encounter problems with the current EA system and the effects on local communities.

BC's new EA process must

--ensure climate targets are met and more-- help steer us towards avoiding dangerous anthropogenic climate change in a meaningful and equitable way . We need to be on guard against projects that dodge their contributions to emissions, like ski resorts that rely on (and so foster) airplane travel by guests from abroad.

-- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise

--Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence

--Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments,

Above all, the EA process needs to move beyond being a process of information gathering followed by Ministerial rubber stamps. Projects need to be stopped if they violate indigenous rights, contribute to excess greenhouse gas emissions (especially when lower emission production and consumption systems are available), or have ill thought through contingency plans around risky infrastructure like mining dams. The EA process needs to be backstopped by a broader system of strong environmental laws, and serve to guarantee to the public that projects will have plans and procedures for following the law, avoiding accidents, and contingency plans for when things go awry.

=====

As far as environmental assessment is concerned i believe that the process should be more open and transparent using independent scientists not industry hires.

Any projects which have a possibility of contaminating ground water or our oceans should be held to an even higher standard.

The air ,the waters ,and the soil are ultimately all we have as a world to sustain us.

We as people deserve input in the process of deciding how and if earth is to survive into the future.

Big business has an opportunity to make money , but it should not be done in such a way as to threaten the lives of future generations.

=====

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

With the temperature slated to hit 31° in Vancouver today, it seems like a perfect time to be spelling out what I think environmental assessments in BC should look like from here on.

We've had years of environmental assessment that treated development per se as some kind of absolute good. It isn't. It's a money-making endeavour that may or may not provide any benefit to anyone beyond shareholders. It's up to us to make sure that only projects that do get approved.

So, first and foremost, the assessment process needs to be protected from the election cycle. Stable, long-term, apolitical funding is the only way for this to be above the hack and slash of purely partisan agendas. The process must be isolated from that.

Same thing for monitoring, oversight and compliance. The lax regulatory climate of Mike Harris's government led directly to Walkerton, just like the lax regulatory climate of Stephen Harper's led to the Maple Leaf Listeria outbreak. The lax regulatory climate we became accustomed to in BC in recent years led to Kinder Morgan putting anti-spawning nets in salmon streams, for which they were punished to the tune of a little over \$900— less than people fighting the pipeline are being fined for peaceful protest.

There should be no exceptions from assessment, period. No fast-track for energy projects, for example, as the feds, incredibly, have opted for. Fast-track always favours the liars, scammers and profiteers, because truth and consequences always take time to catch up, and even when they do, the damage is done.

If we're to fast-track anything, it should be economic activity that prioritizes a shift away from a fossil fuel-based economy and rampant exploitation of raw natural resources, and will create green jobs and tangible economic benefits for indigenous British Columbians.

The same people have always had a seat at the table when development decisions are made, and their voices are much too loud: the people who will profit, or hope to in future, e.g. lobbyists. The only thing we need to hear from that group in conducting an environmental assessment is nothing, because profitability has nothing to say on the matter.

As the Premier aptly noted in a speech to Victoria-area business leaders, our economic future as a province is indivisible from that of BC's First Nations. That's what the Tsilhqot'in decision means, really, because it acknowledges that consent, not consultation, is a legal requirement for development affecting First Nations. Obviously, any EA process that failed to respect that fact would be invalid.

No industry-funded science should be allowed as evidence in an EA process, period. When the Glenbow

discovered proof that Esso Resources had buried the evidence that they understood the link between fossil fuels and climate change as far back as the '80s, it provided a crystal-clear study of how corporate self-interest corrupts science. We've seen plenty of similar cases since.

I'm putting this next part in all upper-case characters, because even though it's late in the list, it should be a first principle: THE PUBLIC HAS THE RIGHT TO MEANINGFUL INPUT. Meaningful, so the oil company organizing a night where the sheep to be fleeced are allowed to bleat for a bit, before some compliant regulatory body rubber stamps the approval doesn't cut it.

Last but not least, if it's going to blow our climate targets, it's dead in the water. Shouldn't need to be said, but it does.

Please use this opportunity to put BC on a sane, sustainable path for future development.

=====

Environmental assessments should be done by the government so as to be impartial. Otherwise the companies that do the assessments have to lie in order to stay employed.

=====

A healthy environment is key to the continuation of the human race on this planet. It is essential that the private and public projects demonstrate zero negative impact on the quality of air, water and soil in their surroundings before receiving approval to proceed. Fracking, and other highly polluting industries should be halted, until better, non polluting methods are developed to extract resources.

=====

When projects that have a direct environmental impact are proposed I would like to see feedback from environmental scientists that outline what environmental impacts the project will have. The environmental costs of the project, which species will be adversely effected, and how badly. How will people living near or in the proposed area be effected? If people are not in favour of the project I would like their input to be respected and considered. I would also like to see alternative proposals for projects that are environmentally friendly.

=====

Fair and effective environmental assessment of ANY project seen to have a negative effect on our natural places must be subject to rigorous scrutiny and include all cumulative impacts from other impacts at the landscape level.

Such an assessment also needs to include adequate and meaningful opportunities for public education and input (including funding if necessary).

It goes without saying that informed indigenous First Nations consent needs to be obtained for any project which has a negative impact on their traditional lands.

The foundation of any review needs to be based on non-biased, scientific evidence which is open to peer review.

=====

Thank you for reviewing the Environmental Assessment process in B.C. I believe we need to make these improvements to the process:

1. Take the effects on climate change into account. We must reduce carbon emissions and we cannot count on promises of other jurisdictions to reduce their emissions if we sell them e.g. LNG in hopes of them reducing their coal burning.
2. The emissions we produce in BC in extraction and shipping, as well as the emissions by the end users need to be factored in .
3. Adequate time for community representatives to make submissions to the assessment process
4. Cross examination of expert witnesses must be allowed
5. Decision panels needs to include expert representatives who are NOT from the industry involved in the proposed project
6. Adequate time for First Nations consultation must be allowed, with resources provided as needed to support the FN response.
7. Process should consider requiring proponents to put up a bond to ensure that cleanup windup costs are not borne by taxpayers.

=====

A lot of damage has been done to our environment with no accountability. Companies walk off and taxpayers pay all the bills. This has to stop! We need the laws changed to protect our environment, marine life, etc.

=====

Updating Environmental Assessment (EA) laws in BC is long overdue. This is an opportunity for BC to become a leader in EAs.

I encourage BC to follow through on its proposals to legally establish:

A purpose provision in the new assessment law that includes protection of the environment, fostering sustainability, and implementation of UNDRIP as core purposes of assessment;

An early engagement phase for each assessment that results in a collaboratively-developed Assessment Plan, informed by public engagement, to set out the scope, procedures and methods for assessment, as well as how provincial and Indigenous processes and decision-making will align, including funding, timelines, and opportunities for public participation;

Legislative factors and criteria that assessments and assessment decisions must be based on, as well as a requirement to give reasons for a decision, to ensure transparency and accountability;

More opportunities for early and ongoing public participation, including types of engagement beyond traditional comment periods, and a public participation funding program;

Transparent online posting of all assessment information (except sensitive Indigenous knowledge), including plain language materials and monitoring and compliance information;

Recognition of Indigenous nations as decision-makers in environmental assessment;

a new Reconciliation Commission to assist with dispute resolution regarding implementation of UNDRIP in assessments;

Requirements to assess effects on vulnerable populations, including gender analysis and impacts specific to Indigenous women and girls;

A legal framework and funding for regional and strategic assessment to address “big picture” issues such as managing cumulative effects, including criteria for prioritizing regions for assessment; and

New tools for monitoring, compliance and enforcement, including links with the role of Indigenous guardian programs, and continuing engagement of public participants in compliance and enforcement.

If the following issues are not meaningfully addressed through legislative reform, BC will fail to meet its goals of enhancing public confidence, advancing reconciliation, and protecting the environment in relation to assessments. BC needs to go further to ensure:

Independent evidence and oversight of assessments

The current approach to assessment in BC – whereby the proponent generates virtually all the evidence, which is reviewed by an informal technical advisory group – is inadequate and needs to end.

Regional “Reconciliation” or “Sustainability” offices proposed in the Discussion Paper should be implemented as independent science centres to assist with generating, overseeing and/or peer reviewing scientific evidence in project and regional assessments, in balance with Indigenous knowledge.

Unless otherwise determined through collaboratively developed Assessment Plans and related government-to-government agreements, independent or Indigenous-led panels should be the default for assessment.

Outcomes from key assessment stages, such as the assessment report and recommendations, and Ministers’ decision on whether to approve a project, should be clearly subject to appeal to ensure transparency and accountability.

More meaningful public participation and participant funding:

Legislation should establish public hearings as a default component of the assessment process.

Public engagement must be led by the body conducting the assessment – not the proponent.

A public participation funding program should be established in legislation to ensure sufficient funding is reliably and independently distributed.

Cumulative effects are addressed through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments:

The legal criteria for which projects get assessed must be broadened beyond current, narrow thresholds based on production-capacity (e.g. the amount of mineral ore that a mine plans to produce each year). Instead, all projects that stand to impact sustainability must be assessed; to help ensure this, legislation should provide a mechanism for the public and Indigenous peoples to trigger assessments.

The ability to exempt projects from assessment must be removed.

Legislation should provide triggers and requirements for regional assessments, which would establish a

legally binding “floor” for environmental protection that applies to project assessments and provincial decisions in the region.

Projects are rejected if they don’t meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent:

Assessment can’t continue to just be a process for making bad projects less bad before approving them. A new assessment law should require decision-makers to select the option from among reasonable alternatives that best protects Indigenous title and rights and safeguards ecological, cultural, social, economic and health values. This must include the option of not proceeding with the proposal.

Projects that fail to meet defined legislative sustainability and reconciliation criteria – including Indigenous consent, a climate test and respecting ecological limits – must not be approved under a new assessment law.

=====

A new and revitalized environmental assessment process must:

Require that projects are reviewed in a cumulative impacts framework. Looking at only one project without considering the impacts of other projects or other environmental issues puts our ecosystems at risk.

Ensure projects require informed indigenous consent and uphold the principles of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

Make sure that all projects pass a climate test. Long-term sustainability means we can’t keep approving projects that lock in decades of greenhouse gas emissions.

Provide opportunities for meaningful public participation, including funding for participants.

Require independent scientific evidence, rather than data provided by project developers, and unbiased scientific oversight.

These factors must inform the new process for the good of all British Columbians. Please draft the legislation accordingly.

=====

Please strengthen the environmental review of all projects by including more input from citizens and especially from independent scientists and from First Nations that will be affected. Please give very careful attention to the effect on our climate targets as time is running out to reduce greenhouse gases.

Please ensure that ALL prefects have much better oversight. We don’t want to see any more disasters like Mount Polley, that are preventable with diligent oversight by non company experts.

=====

Approvals are the first step with no agreements to be signed until all levels of government are approved. Need true independent oversight and ongoing monitoring. There needs to be large environmental bonds for big projects. The bond to be kept in trust in perpetuity until the project is closed, cleaned up and fully remediated.

=====

It is time to vastly improve on environmental oversight in British Columbia.

For far too long, this province has allowed environmentally devastating projects to go ahead without considering the health and well-being of local communities.

I support the BC government to overhaul the way environmental reviews are conducted, insisting upon:

- all new projects must be thoroughly reviewed by trained scientists and other professionals
- First Nations assistance in assessments
- increased input from citizens
- increased input from independent scientists
- rejection of projects that would not meet B.C.'s climate targets
- rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent
- overall respect for water as a precious resource, noting that "water is life" is as true here in B.C. as it is anywhere.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

I hope that the lives of myself, my family, my friends, and all living creatures here in B.C. may remain healthy and enjoyable. Protecting our environment means protecting our own future.

=====

I support the Dogwood's ideas on the overhaul to our environmental reviews!

A next-generation environmental assessment law must:

- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments
- Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding
- Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
- Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected

a next-generation environmental assessment law must:

- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments
- Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding
- Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
- Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected

We encourage BC to follow through on its proposals to legally establish:

- a purpose provision in the new assessment law that includes protection of the environment, fostering sustainability, and implementation of UNDRIP as core purposes of assessment;
- an early engagement phase for each assessment that results in a collaboratively-developed Assessment Plan, informed by public engagement, to set out the scope, procedures and methods for assessment, as well as how provincial and Indigenous processes and decision-making will align, including funding, timelines, and opportunities for public participation;
- legislative factors and criteria that assessments and assessment decisions must be based on, as well as a requirement to give reasons for a decision, to ensure transparency and accountability;

- more opportunities for early and ongoing public participation, including types of engagement beyond traditional comment periods, and a public participation funding program;
- transparent online posting of all assessment information (except sensitive Indigenous knowledge), including plain language materials and monitoring and compliance information;
- recognition of Indigenous nations as decision-makers in environmental assessment;
- a new Reconciliation Commission to assist with dispute resolution regarding implementation of UNDRIP in assessments;
- requirements to assess effects on vulnerable populations, including gender analysis and impacts specific to Indigenous women and girls;
- a legal framework and funding for regional and strategic assessment to address “big picture” issues such as managing cumulative effects, including criteria for prioritizing regions for assessment; and
- new tools for monitoring, compliance and enforcement, including links with the role of Indigenous guardian programs, and continuing engagement of public participants in compliance and enforcement.

BC needs to go further to ensure:

- Independent evidence and oversight of assessments
 - o The current approach to assessment in BC – whereby the proponent generates virtually all the evidence, which is reviewed by an informal technical advisory group – is inadequate and needs to end.
 - A new assessment law must ensure a mandatory role in assessments for experts independent of provincial regulators and the proponent, as well as rigorous peer review of scientific and technical information. It must also provide for Indigenous-led studies, and provide mechanisms to enable public participants to engage experts and test evidence, including early engagement requirements to ensure public participants proactively shape how this occurs.
 - o Regional “Reconciliation” or “Sustainability” offices proposed in the Discussion Paper should be implemented as independent science centres to assist with generating, overseeing and/or peer reviewing scientific evidence in project and regional assessments, in balance with Indigenous knowledge.
 - o Unless otherwise determined through collaboratively developed Assessment Plans and related government-to-government agreements, independent or Indigenous-led panels should be the default for assessment.
 - o Outcomes from key assessment stages, such as the assessment report and recommendations, and Ministers’ decision on whether to approve a project, should be clearly subject to appeal to ensure transparency and accountability.
- More meaningful public participation and participant funding
 - o Legislation should establish public hearings as a default component of the assessment process.
 - o Public engagement must be led by the body conducting the assessment – not the proponent.
 - o A public participation funding program should be established in legislation to ensure sufficient funding is reliably and independently distributed.
- Cumulative effects are addressed through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
 - o The legal criteria for which projects get assessed must be broadened beyond current, narrow thresholds based on production-capacity (e.g. the amount of mineral ore that a mine plans to produce each year). Instead, all projects that stand to impact sustainability must be assessed; to help ensure this, legislation should provide a mechanism for the public and Indigenous peoples to trigger assessments.
 - o The ability to exempt projects from assessment must be removed.
 - o Legislation should provide triggers and requirements for regional assessments, which would establish a legally binding “floor” for environmental protection that applies to project assessments and provincial decisions in the region.
- Projects are rejected if they don’t meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

- o Assessment can't continue to just be a process for making bad projects less bad before approving them. A new assessment law should require decision-makers to select the option from among reasonable alternatives that best protects Indigenous title and rights and safeguards ecological, cultural, social, economic and health values. This must include the option of not proceeding with the proposal.
- o Projects that fail to meet defined legislative sustainability and reconciliation criteria – including Indigenous consent, a climate test and respecting ecological limits – must not be approved under a new assessment law.

=====

Our most urgent issues are to protect the environment, especially against climate change, and to make just arrangements with First Nations.

Environmental laws and regulations should be based on these priorities, and be fully enforced.

=====

Some quick thoughts:

-prioritize strict GHG emissions reduction and elimination, make it mandatory for any new project to lay out their clear-&-scientific company plan for GHG elimination --and oversee that such is followed through on

-prioritize fresh water preservation: if it risks or destroys fresh water, don't allow it. Do not allow tailings collections: if a company cannot recycle its water use and clean the water back into totally untainted fresh water again, it should not be allowed to proceed with its project

- Net zero GHG emissions: all emissions to be caused by a project (carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, methane) must be offset by other means/projects by the company--if it cannot then it should not be allowed

-ban megadams: blocking or displacing great bodies of water should not be allowed for ecological reasons up&downstream (e.g. flooding new areas leads to new methane emissions from rotting vegetation) and climate change reasons (unreliable water flow levels)

-ban all new fossil fuel projects

-ban fracking

-speculation: Can hempcrete replace concrete? If so, it will be greatly beneficial in helping absorb CO2 as opposed to concrete's emissions, so I hear... hempcrete could then be made a mandatory replacer in construction projects (if it truly is just as strong, which is unknown to me)

-prioritize safety and reliability, especially in light of expected climatic upheavals due to anthropogenic climate changes which we are now living in (drought, fires, flooding, increase in extreme storms and weather phenomena, etc.)

=====

It is hard to have confidence in the BC environmental process. It seems that all project are approved with some conditions. It is unclear if the government has the capacity or will to enforce those conditions. Please ensure:

- Study cumulative impact of the project, combined with existing/planned activities in the area
- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent
- Build BC Government capacity to enforce conditions for approval, and bring fines to a level that will make promoter to comply or the power to cancel the approval.

=====

We need frequent and thorough inspections of resource extraction and pipelines, to enforce existing and increased legislation. We need meaningful and effective punishment, to discourage law-breakers. We must engage and employ First Nations people as assessors, inspectors, and legislators in this process.

=====

At the bottom of these comments are a list of things I would like to see corrected in respect of the current environmental assessment.

1a. The environmental assessment board should have the full authority to consider all relevant evidence - direct and indirect - that affects the health of the natural environment, ecosystems of the marine life and land ecosystems and air, that are relevant to the health and safety of humans either locally, and downstream to other localities.

1. Expansion of existing projects should be subject to an Environmental Assessment to the same extent as if that project were new and under the most stringent environmental standards . For example. Kinder Morgan's should have had to apply for the expansion of the Transmountain Pipeline as if it was a new project and under the strictest environmental regulations available. Room for errors should fall on the side of caution in favour of the environment and health and safety of humans.

Expansions should be subject to the strictest form of regulations in favour of protecting the natural environment, ecosystems and the health of the communities directly affected and the economies directly affected.

For example, new and current facts and evidence should be presented on the risk impact of expanding tanker traffic in Burrard Inlet from 1 to 30 per month. (risks should not be assessed merely in the context of the original application to lay the pipeline).

The evidence should consider all aspects of increased risk - ranging from e.g. risk of tanker spills, to tanker emissions pollution, tanker water pollution, enforcement of tanker violations in Inlet waters, current evidence regarding the health of coastal waters and wildlife, current evidence on the basis of health of the community and people (including impact of increased tanker emissions and water pollution on pregnant women, people with asthma, older people and the common health population.)

Permits should not be granted at all unless the company is willing to put up a trust fund, which is fully funded and will cover all of the costs of a new or expanded pipeline - for example - and its risks. BC Citizens and Canadians should not have to 'chase' corporations who have liquified all of their assets and cannot be found or pursued.

Example, the evidence on KM ability to satisfy a fire in the tanker farms such that the Burnaby community and those in the vicinity would be maximally protected such that the pipeline is considered very low risk of fire hazard and very highly insured against harm by fire if indeed a fire were to start. The communities in the high risk zone should have specially weighted input on these decisions.

2 Economic costs should be calculated as part of the evidence of the risks of a new project or an expansion. What are the costs to the community food intake, or quality or food. What are the costs to the tourism industry and its businesses - especially local businesses along the coast. What does 30 tankers look like in Burrard Inlet and what kind of eye pollution do they present to the community and visiting tourists. What does an increase in tanker traffic do to the whale, dolphin, seal and other populations that tourist industries and fisheries depend on.

What are the costs to the global appeal of 'Beautiful British Columbia' for which we are known throughout the world and for whom people come here to enjoy and spend their money.

3. Total economic risks should explicitly be weighed against the economic benefits pitched by the resource developers to obtain a true economic statement about the economic worthiness of a pipeline. Economic benefits on both sides should be comprehensively demonstrated and publically accessible.

3a The public should be able to fully participate and attend the Environmental Assessment Hearings.

4. Importantly, 'evidence' should be holistic and contextual and should include scientific evidence that has not been constrained by corporate (or other subjective) interests and roadblocks.

5. Any obstacles to independent environmental scientists' ability to perform their scientific analysis should be removed as much as possible. In these situations Corporate rights to trade secrets or other forms of protections must not override the right of communities and scientific investigation to understand the risks involved in using trademarked chemicals (as an example) proposed in a new project. Resource companies should not be allowed to avoid having their products examined. They should have to fully disclose the product, materials, plants, premises etc. in all of the combinations and contexts within which the product is proposing to be used.

This full disclosure should be mandatory and all loop holes closed so that honest, authentic and thorough analysis of chemicals proposed are fully analyzable in the contexts of proposed use (e.g. over water tables, in actual sea water under the sea that is shared with other ecosystems).

6. Evidence should include the relationships of certain risks to the relationship of the entire ecosystems. We should be able to consider the whole ecosystem, how it works, how it supplies health to the community and what effect certain natural development has as a chain effect up the eco-system.

7. All reviews should be fully comprehensive, detailed, context based, science based and resource companies should have to fully disclose and not be able to hide behind trade secrets or any other protection.

If resource developers want to make money developing resources they must be willing to disclose how they will develop and what products and chemicals are involved in specific contextual terms.

8. Collaboration with First Nations is essential and must be authentic, genuine and not just 'lip service' or 'going through the motions'. First Nations must be given an opportunity to lead environmental development consistent with their ancestral long term stewardship of the land and waters and their relationship to the Earth as a beloved relative that must be respected and protected as THE source of life to humans and animals and not raped or exploited for short term profit until nothing is left.

First Nations consultations should respect the fact of their communal and economic autonomy and give them an opportunity to become true economic and governing partners in resource development where their stewardship of the land and waters is balanced with their community economics, and needs. Give them a chance to lead by balancing extreme capitalism with the holistic value of the Earth and the success of traditional ancestors. For example, First Nations should be able to lead resource projects by stipulating that clean energy should be used instead of the status quo. First Nations should be able to dictate, attract and lead new partners who will investment in new clean methods. They should be consulted at all the places along the development process.

Capitalist 'efficiency' should not be the absolute measure of value. First Nations have valuable holistic views of the world that is capable of balancing single minded 'efficiency' with leadership and protection of land, air and water values that supply the very basis for any economic activity. Efficiency often means highest profit to the executives and shareholders at cheapest cost. However, when a little efficiency can be sacrificed to protect the ecosystem, long term health interests, and providing higher paying jobs First Nations can lead. Solar energy is an example of this. Solar energy is considered inefficient by the oil industry because it employs so many people to construct the solar fields and panels. Allow First Nations to lead clean economics and clean energy investment and we will have a healthier environment and healthier economy.

New clean investment can be lead by First Nations. They should have the opportunity to break the monopoly of the current oligarchies and open up new clean investment for which Canada is prime investment territory.

8. Citizens directly and indirectly affected by the new project should be able to attend and participate and be consulted as equal stake holders in the energy board assessment process.

9. Projects that violate or fail to allow climate change target commitments made by provincial, federal at the micro or macro (global paris accord) level should be rejected.

10, It should be the onus of the governments or resource developers to prove that a project falls within climate change targets - such as the feds on the PAN CANADIAN CLIMATE CHANGE AGREEMENT. The govt and resource companies should not be able to just 'say' that a project falls within their targets. They should have to DEMONSTRATE to the public and to the Environmental Assessment board and stakeholders that a project meets the target.

=====

We are unprepared for climate change. We are behaving in shortsighted and ignorant ways to preserve the health of our lands. We have the expertise to make better decisions. How many times will we ignore our scientists, our First Nations people, our citizens and how many times will the NDP ignore their promises to protect our farmland and future? We need to listen to our collective expertise BEFORE making decisions that will create negative impacts in the future. We need to honour treaty agreements with First Nations. You need to know when to shut down projects when they are shown to you to be unfeasible economically and environmentally. Make the tough decisions now to stand for the environment.

=====

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the BC's Environmental assessment process and the need for reform.

I would like to ensure that all assessments are subject to a cumulative impacts assessment. I urge you to terminate the professional reliance legislation that Gordon Campbell introduced as it is inherently biased. I believe that we need independent science to take precedent. I urge you to support the input of Indigenous groups and communities.

=====

I am grateful for the opportunity to comment on BC's environmental assessment reform. Indeed it needs a major overhaul. The current law and processes are failing British Columbians and the lands and waters we rely on because they do not take an ecosystem or cumulative impacts approach. Environmental assessments in BC currently have many problems: proponents control the science and evidence brought forward, public participation is usually relegated to Open Houses with one-sided information, and little is done to address cumulative effects.

Your efforts to improve the process are strong steps towards better environmental assessments. You have proposed some strong steps to improve on the status quo, including regional assessments taking a bigger picture view of development, early and improved engagement with communities, and honouring the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

But more needs to be done for British Columbia to have fair and effective rules for environmental assessments. In order to ensure a robust law in BC, we need to:

- ~ensure that evidence and oversight of assessments are independent of the proponent
- ~require more meaningful public participation and participant funding
- ~address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
- ~reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

This is a once-in-a-generation chance to improve the rules around projects in BC. Take the strong steps we need to protect our air, lands and waters for every British Columbian.

=====

I'm sorry this is a rushed comment, but I have limited access to the internet before the deadline. So, in short, I strongly believe BC needs much more stringent environmental assessments. I believe the need is urgent as many experts believe we are at a critical point and if we don't act now it will be too late. Things that should be included are extensive, independent expert assessments, proper consultation with First Nations, thorough consideration of cumulative effects, ensuring environmental concerns are prioritized over economical ones.

My apologies again for a very poorly written letter...

=====

Polluters pay up!

=====

I'm writing in support of proposed legislation to change the way environmental reviews are conducted. Environmental reviews should have the force of law, be enforceable, be accountable (have frequent publicly available updates and the possibility of public input outside the review process itself), be representative (have the full participation of citizens and concerned scientists, First Nations), and comprehensive (insuring that all public projects and private projects with implications for the common good actually be reviewed). No longer can review processes be ignored, hidden, or suppressed. These processes are the very fabric of the working out of the common weal. They must reflect that important role.

=====

To Premier John Horgan and the BC Govt.

I am writing to express my concern with the current process for environmental assessment, and to encourage your government to do better.

The BC Govt. has been reckless in the past, approving projects with little environmental assessment, and in many cases supporting dangerous private projects with tax money, rather than requiring that private companies use their own funds to demonstrate the safety of a potential project.

While many points have already been made on this topic and don't need repeating, I would like to say that I believe the key is good, impartial, science. Too often, science is paid for and driven by industry. This cannot be the case. Government must be the gate keeper and write the paycheques that keep impartial scientists working in their labs. There can be no doubt in the minds of the people doing the work that they will not be fired for writing a report that isn't favourable to the applicant of a permit. While Govt. must pay the bills, the cost of environmental assessment must be carried by industry in the form of permit application fees.

=====

I greatly appreciate the government's endeavour to review the environmental assessment process. BC is a special place on the planet with a vast diversity of natural wonders that is admired around the world. We should have stringent measures in place to ensure that our province's water, land, species are robustly protected. BC can be a world leader through the application of intelligent, scientifically-based appraisals of which consistently maintains core goals: 1) minimizing/reducing/eliminating greenhouse gas generation; 2) maintaining current old growth forests for their plethora of inherent benefits; 3) protection of species at risk; 4) preservation of marine and fresh water quality. The assessment process should require decision-makers to select the option that reasonably best protects indigenous title and rights and safeguards ecological, cultural, social, economic and health values. This process must include the option of not proceeding with the proposal. Assessments should not be just be a process for making bad projects less damaging before approving them.

=====

Dear Friends: environmental reviews should be much stricter. Especially on oil development. We must move away from further oil and gas resource development urgently. It's almost too late already.

=====

Concerned citizens and not fossil fuel lobbyists should be involved in environmental assessments.

=====

We are in a clear climate crisis already, and the schedule for fires, heat waves, deadened oceans and lakes is way ahead of what was predicted at this point. I am watching more fires eat up homes and forests and land in BC, and worry that my family and I might be fleeing our homes at some point soon. Please ensure that environmental reviews put climate and environment first, no matter what. Union jobs are to be found in renewables too, and in sustainable projects. Thanks for listening.

=====

I live in Kamloops, where we narrowly averted the Ajax Mine project, which local doctors, independent scientists and local indigenous communities all opposed because they viewed it as potentially disastrous to air quality, water quality, public health and First Nations culture. The process lasted several years and continues to divide our community, although the proponent submitted a factually inaccurate proposal that never should have been allowed to move forward. British Columbians deserve a process that examines potential environmental impacts independently and thoroughly, respects the views of First Nations and independent scientists and medical professionals, and holds the proponent accountable for factual misrepresentations in their applications. The environmental review process needs to be updated to account for climate targets as well. Please make the process more rigorous!

=====

We need a total overhaul of the approving process, relying on Native rights, environmental impact, and greener alternatives in the mix. If its not good for the earth or our peoples, we dont need it.

=====

Thank you for taking the time to consider my thoughts on how I would like the environmental consultation process to be reformed.

Below are some key points that I believe are necessary for a successful reform of this issue:

- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments
- Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding

- Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
- Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected
- Hold accountable with serious legal and monetary consequences the companies that have moved forward with a project that causes spills and environmental disasters

=====

I am 27 year old female born in BC and I have lived here all my life. I think it is fundamentally unethical for government to risk its citizens' health and environmental well being and biodiversity of such a naturally beautiful place on earth that brings residents numerous health benefits as well as industry for tourism for antiquated polluting and non-regenerative industries such as gas pipelines and unregulated mining. I expect better from the educated politicians in Canadian government and I demand more respect from them as well - I want more assessments, tighter regulations, more transparency and I want BC to be a worldwide example this new chapter in sustainable modern societies. I am 27 and tired of being embarrassed by the lagging of my province.

=====

I am excited and hopeful about the opportunity to chart a more just and sustainable future for B.C. Reforming our Environmental Assessment laws is a major chance for us to put respect for indigenous title in action and to safeguard the health of our communities and ecosystems.

I started my career in California, where the majority of development projects and plans are subject to an assessment regime under CEQA. Based on that experience, I assumed it would be standard for major projects to be subject to extensive, independent environmental and health studies before approval; to involve several rounds of public input (including how to determine the scope of the assessment at the outset); to require the participation and sign-off of any relevant jurisdiction, including Tribes; and to include consideration of alternatives before any approvals could be considered. Most importantly, bad projects--or projects that communities or affected jurisdictions opposed for health or environmental reasons--were often rejected because of the information and input collected during the review.

Then I moved to B.C. I was appalled to learn just how lax and industry-captured the environmental assessment process was. I came to understand that B.C.'s government under the B.C. Liberals had essentially handed over responsibility for assessments to industry and the federal government, leading to travesties like the Kinder Morgan approval, the Mt. Polley sludge breach and the total lack of assessment for a new coal port proposed at Fraser Surrey Docks. It is a system essentially set up to approve any project put forward.

I am thrilled that your government is giving us a chance for a new regime that includes basics like public participation that matters, considering alternatives, using credible, independent science, considering climate, health, cultural and cumulative impacts, widening the scope of assessed projects to include any proposal that could negatively affect our communities and our climate, and making rejection of bad projects possible.

Even more important, however, is the chance to make B.C.'s environmental assessment regime a hallmark of reconciliation with Indigenous people. True reconciliation can only occur when the colonial state, colonial society or settler Canadians change the way things are done to reconcile our lives and systems to the inherent rights and title held by the indigenous people on this land. Consultation is not enough. B.C.'s new environmental assessment laws must recognize indigenous title over the land we share, respect indigenous knowledge alongside science, involve indigenous communities as equal or greater partners in the assessment process, and require indigenous consent for environmental certificate approvals.

Thank you for undertaking this important reform and considering input from indigenous and non-indigenous British Columbians. I look forward to seeing our input reflected in your government's proposed legislation in the fall.

=====

In my opinion, responsible governance of environmental issues would include oversight by government agencies, NEVER by industry itself. There should be strong scientific evidence for all decisions made and First Nations must be involved in solutions for issues involving their lands and rights to hunt and fish and gather plants. I believe we are on the cusp of forever losing many of our most valued resources - our native Pacific salmon, our waterways, our resident whale population. Time is of the essence regarding taking ACTION to halt some of the current practices of allowing industry to police itself, of allowing marine fish farms to continue polluting our waters and killing off our native fish.

=====

The time for action to take environmental decision making away from the industry and into the hands of an enlightened, science aware, government is now. Not deferred until the decision is made for us by dire necessity. Industry has already proven that it is not equipped to make the decisions that are to its own benefit.

Please, for the sakes of our children, be proactive on climate change mitigation and transition.

=====

Our natural environment, the climate, the animals, the First Nations have existed for millennia. In a few short decades we have driven species to extinction, driven others to the brink of extinction, polluted and ravaged our once magnificent lakes and forests and coasts. Our First Nations have been marginalized and ignored.

Please employ the precautionary principle. Place those things which are irreplaceable above the greed of a few.

Think about what we leave behind for those yet to come.

=====

This government has a unique opportunity to truly show leadership by creating the strongest environmental assessment (EA) laws in the country.

To adequately and responsibly protect our environment for future generations, BC's new EA laws must:

- 1) EAs must be applied to a broader range of project types. Timber harvest and related activities which are currently unregulated (professional reliance is terribly inadequate management) should be required to conduct EA.
- 2) Ensure EAs are conducted with independent evidence and oversight of assessments, including scientific peer-review, regulator and technical expert input.
- 3) Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding
- 4) Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
- 5) Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected.

This government's currently proposed approach to updating EA law is weak and fails to address the above issues. I sincerely hope that your government will take this opportunity to protect our environment seriously - it would be a shame to add this issue to the growing list of poor decisions (Site C, continued logging of old-growth forest, wolf-culling) and environmental inaction (inadequate habitat protection for species at risk e.g., caribou).

I urge you to show true leadership and create EA laws that live up to the Vision for Next Generation Environmental Assessment.

=====

My husband, [redacted] and I are very supportive of your overhaul of environmental reviews in BC. Assessments can't continue to just be a process for making bad projects less bad before approving them. A new assessment law should require decision-makers to select the option from among reasonable alternatives that best protects Indigenous title and rights and safeguards ecological, cultural, social, economic and health values. This must include the option of not proceeding with the proposal.

=====

I am very concerned about the number of projects that have been allowed to begin without proper review prior to construction, the lack of effective monitoring, and the reluctance to impose real penalties on companies that flout the law. I will name only a few of which I'm aware.

Mount Polley - a disaster with no penalty

Fish farms that are not permitted to operate in the country of origin set up camp in BC. DFO has done nothing to correct the situation and, even after much study by marine biologists, the BC government has renewed existing licenses for another four years.

Kinder Morgan gets fined less than \$1000 for disruption of spawning beds while protester are charged with criminal Contempt of Court.

Agricultural land is destroyed by the Site C dam at an every increasing number of billions of dollars which will in increasing costs to Hydro customers, the BC taxpayer, or both. Electricity is already too expensive and people are choosing to use gas because its all they can afford.

There is too much reliance on assessments done by industry professionals.

Kinder Morgan pipeline proceeds without a proper assessment of impact on climate change, not to mention the impact of spills and increased tanker traffic.

Aboriginal concerns do not seem to be on the radar of either provincial or federal governments with projects like KM and Site C going ahead over the objections of first nations groups.

Environmental regulations need to be properly reviewed with real input from all stakeholders including ordinary people (not like the KM farce). Industry should not be allowed to create its own guidelines and enforcement. The penalties for non-compliance need to be meaningful.

=====

Terms of reference for all assessments must include all up stream down stream effects as well as accumulative effects of the project. The terms of reference needs to be established by the government and not the company applying for an environmental certificate. It is not the provinces role to ensure the company can meet the terms it's the companies role to do so. The environment is the only concern from this point forward and economic benefit should not be considered within the terms of reference as this is always used as the more weighted reason for giving approval. No net loss is the goal and if new businesses require land not already impacted or land recovering from impact then the impact is to great and should be denied. No more money changing hands to get what a company wants. We have our fair share of the natural environment already and it's time to think longer term.

=====

Just as we pay recycle fees when purchasing appliances or beverages, BC should require fees from companies that could have an environmental impact that would cover the cost of clean-up and restoration of their sites.

=====

Full environmental assessment done and results published in the on the front pages of the newspaper

=====

Environmental reviews should be conducted by independent scientists as well as input from citizens and local government. We need to make decisions that protect our environment and the animals in it.

=====

As the Vice President of Eaglet Lake Farmers Institute in rural central BC, it has been experienced that the EAO process is deeply flawed for rural participation and agricultural stakeholders. The EAO certification process requires an appeal process for those that will be impacted by such projects when no public consultation has taken place. Concerns about red listed species, agricultural impacts, social impacts, economic impacts all need a variety of perspectives received before certification. ELFI (a 100 year old organization) missed out completely, the certification took place, direct contact to the EAO office was made on numerous occasions during the assessment application period, no reply was provided until certification was granted, too late for any rural concerns to be included. As permits moved along and

the above issues were addressed once again - responses from the company in question came in the form of the following reply - we have our EAO certification! : (So much for our lake, community, agricultural growth plans, red listed species, air, water, wildlife and human health!!!!!!

=====

As the Vice President of Eaglet Lake Farmers Institute in rural central BC, it has been experienced that the EAO process is deeply flawed for rural participation and agricultural stakeholders. The EAO certification process requires an appeal process for those that will be impacted by such projects when no public consultation has taken place. Concerns about red listed species, agricultural impacts, social impacts, economic impacts all need a variety of perspectives received before certification. ELFI (a 100 year old organization) missed out completely, the certification took place, direct contact to the EAO office was made on numerous occasions during the assessment application period, no reply was provided until certification was granted, too late for any rural concerns to be included. As permits moved along and the above issues were addressed once again - responses from the company in question came in the form of the following reply - we have our EAO certification! : (So much for our lake, community, agricultural growth plans, red listed species, air, water, wildlife and human health!!!!!!

=====

I support BC First Nations' independent rights to veto this project.
I support full implementation of UNDRIP.
I oppose this pipeline .

=====

I'm looking forward to seeing a strong, thorough environmental review process for ALL proposed projects on the table, bar none.

The review should be conducted with indepth analysis of the impacts to the land, the water, the air the climate, and the people that would be directly affected. It should be conducted by impartial scientists and first nations as partners in ensuring there will be no harm to any of the above. The review should not be rushed by the proponents who would prefer to bypass this process. In other words, citizens welfare above corporate profit.

=====

I would like to see environmental lawess eased after s tightened up, and polluters pay. It shouldn't be the taxpayer on the hook for cleaning up the mess. Industry and insurance can handle it, they've made enormous profits from our natural resources. Thank you

=====

I support the changes to Environmental Assessments:
Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists

Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

As BC heats up more every summer, and the promised climate change is already happening, strong environmental management becomes absolutely essential. Fossil fuel industries, unless regulated, ignore all of this for their profit.
Please make sure that environmental assessment and reviews are in the hands of those that actually want to keep climate change in check.
Thank you.

=====

There is a need for more transparency and monitoring of all resource projects as well as repercussions when projects fail such as Mt. Polley.
When projects involve the increased production of fossil fuels (e.g. LNG, high carbon content thermal coal from the US through our ports, or bitumen from Alberta) British Columbia must be held accountable for contributing to climate change. When are the increased temperatures, wild fires, a warming Fraser River that reduces salmon runs, etc. going to be linked to the the production of the subsidized fossil fuel industry?

=====

Now is the time to set excellent environmental rules so that future generations do not inherit a ravaged earth. We require rules that protect not only the environment and Indigenous rights but also all citizens not just companies investing for profit. Fair mechanisms of funding and appeals are required. Clearly, recent events have shown that for profit companies are not good at self oversight. We need arms length oversight for all projects. Let's do it right now.

=====

The Capitalist system has far overstepped its useful bounds - it is incapable of valuing the most important things in life: clean air, water, food, oceans and healthy ecosystems in a naturally bounded climate. On the other hand, First Nations have been living sustainably with cultural systems that have stood the test of more than 10000 years. From which arena would an intelligent management system draw its guidance?
Duh!!!

If a development involves ANY ecological damage, it must be scrutinized at levels beyond mere economics - it must pass the litmus test of ENVIRONMENTAL sustainability. For starters, there should be a moratorium on any further disturbance of natural soils - we have disturbed far too much already and it is one of the major contributors to many of our present environmental problems. All future disturbances must be confined to existing disturbed areas.

Thank you in advance, and placing great trust in you, for acting for the greatest good.

=====

Companies that are caught breaking environmental laws such as Kinder Morgan and their betting in the river to prevent salmon from spawning should be hit with extremely high fines and be subject to intense oversight by a provincial regulator. Not hit with a 900 dollar fine. If that is not possible, then forbid them from doing business in BC or Canada. This would scare others into compliance of our laws and protect precious resources , WATER , AIR, SALMON and WHALES .

=====

As time passes and our world gets even smaller as our natural resources disappear, it is even more important that we listen to the wishes of the people who will have an immediate interest in any project, as well as those independent experts who have no other benefit than to pass on correct truthful details. Those wishing to exploit those resources for their own profit must be held accountable for their actions. Vast destruction of our nature at no cost can no longer be tolerated. Billion dollars in fines and cleanup charges must be incurred by those companies, not the public. This is the only way these companies will be deterred from natural destruction just for their own profits.

=====

Please ensure environmental assessment in B.C. engages with First Nations, listens to scientists and citizens, and allows for rejecting projects that don't meet climate targets or receive Indigenous consent.

=====

It is incumbent on us to ensure environmental assessment in B.C. engages with First Nations, listens to scientists and citizens, and allows for rejecting projects that don't meet climate targets or receive Indigenous consent.

=====

From Mount Polley to Kinder Morgan -- weak environmental oversight has made our province the Wild West of resource extraction. Industry is calling the shots and we are left to literally clean up the mess. It's devastating our communities, it's destroying our environment, and it's just plain unfair.

I am encouraged to know that your government and ministry want to reform environmental assessment in B.C.

B.C.'s environmental management must be in the hands of British Columbians rather than industry.

B.C.'s environmental assessment must listen to scientists and citizens, and engage with First Nations. It must ensure that projects meet climate targets and have Indigenous consent.

I urge your ministry to be a good steward of our environment for current and future generations of all life forms. The health of our land, waters and air is continually under threat and the climate change situation is grave. Please do everything in your power to protect our environment.

=====

I am very pleased that the environmental assessment process is being reviewed; dare I say reformed. We have the opportunity of reflection, access to many independent scientists and concerned citizens to assist with this reformation process. Firstly I would like to say that any legislation no matter how progressive it is, is completely worthless unless it is enforced. The example I have is the Polly Mine disaster ; the largest mining disaster in Canada and the owners/mining company have not been held responsible to clean up after themselves. Shame on you for allowing this to continue to occur; it was bad enough that this happened under the previous liberal without any consequence, except for the huge amount of damage via mining toxins left in this pristine wilderness area.

Our environmental laws need to be enforced.

But also these environmental laws need to look at the cumulative effects of long term projects that harm lands, waters and communities. To have an in depth assessment of a project at its beginning is good, but ongoing assessments throughout their life of any enterprise is best.

Public awareness of BC's EA process must too be a priority as the public is short changed in these processes.

BC's EA must be accountable to the public and have total transparency.

BC's EA must be based on ensuring sustainability.

BC's AE must recognize First Nations' jurisdiction and/reflect the United Nations Declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples.

BC's AE must ensure the coordination & collaboration amongst all jurisdictions involved.

In short BC's AE must ensure sustainability, furthering reconciliation and protect the interests of all communities and ecosystems.

=====

Every project must be under a comprehensive environmental assessment lead by the public. All participants are to be heard and respected. If a project is detrimental to a community or ecosystem, it is to be discarded - not deferred or snuck in any other way. Environmental and social assessments are key to approval based on public input, public decision-making, and the public's well-reasoned decisions and guidelines. Any kind of project impacting people and/or the environment must go through a rigorous democratic process. Stop behaving like a banana republic! Ban all logging of ancient forests and protect important second growth forests. Our forests are being destroyed at the fastest pace ever - most of Vancouver Island has been ravaged savagely. Adhere to democratic decision-making and processes!

=====

I am writing because I believe there is a critical need to update British Columbia's environmental assessment process. As a small business operator along the BC coast, we need to ensure all stakeholders have a voice.

We need to ensure there is independent evidence accepted and transparent oversight of assessments. The public need to be able to provide meaningful input and local groups need support to participate.

It is critical that the assessment address cumulative effects within a region with mandatory regional assessments.

Projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – must be rejected.

=====

I am a university student and the countless times I've learned about risky projects that have brought about deadly destruction to ecosystems is truly depressing. Every time I wonder who was in charge of allowing an operation with such devastating possible outcomes to run. Please, for the health of British Columbians, and all the animals and plants we share the land with, adopt more stringent processes for assessment of all projects. And don't put all the power in the industries hands, especially their "qualified, unbiased" scientists.

=====

I am very encouraged by the actions of the NDP/Green coalition government so far and I hope that this government makes a real important change to our environmental assessment and regulatory processes. These weak laws undermine the legitimacy of development. If citizens could actually trust that resource development projects went through a proper environmental review than it would be much easier to support these kind of projects. I get that resource development is an important part of our jobs and economy so making laws that ensure these projects are not needlessly putting our environment and health at risk would be a win for both our economy and environment. One more point- I just read an incredibly depressing article about a baby orca dying because the west coast orcas are starving due to a lack of fish. The biologists studying their demise suggested that regulating fishing was not enough and that the major problem in the BC waters was tailings from mines that hurt fish populations and agricultural development (<https://www.cbc.ca/radio/asithappens/as-it-happens-friday-edition-1.4731059/this-orca-mother-has-been-holding-her-dead-calf-a-float-for-days-1.4731063>). It would be such a tragedy for these whales to go extinct because of our mismanagement of the environment and it sounds like the main issue is environmental regulation. I feel very hopeful that this government is going to make the changes that are needed here because I actually trust this government, which I think is the first time I can say this about any provincial government I have had.

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC.

I see the need for updating and on a slightly different tack, I DO NOT want a carbon tax. It punishes people who want to stay warm in winter, and who need to use a vehicle. Not everyone can easily hop on a bus, bicycle, or walk to their destinations.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

=====

The environment and natural habitat of BC are not only important for our sustainability and general well-being, they are critical assets that support the livelihoods of countless British Columbians. In the context of the considerable challenges facing the planet, it is paramount that BC steps forward as a leader when it comes to assessing the impact of major infrastructure projects. In the government's review of environmental reviews, I am hopeful that the following core principles will be put in place:

More input from independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would compromise B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

In addition, I'm hopeful to see more rigorous and publicly accessible assessments for major projects, with key findings summarized so that British Columbians can easily understand the implications of projects going forward.

=====

First of all, thank you for providing a public consultation period. I believe it is important for the people of B.C. to have a say in how the province is governed. This is how democracy should function.

Bellow is my input on how Environmental Assessments in B.C. should operate:

- 1) If there is no consent from the First Nations on whose unceded territory the project is proposed, then the project should NOT be build. Period.
- 2) The government of B.C. should fully implement UNDRIP as a model by which it performs any work that intersects with indigenous rights.
- 3) An independent review of projects in B.C. is essential. No more industry backed environmental assessments. Industry backed research is innately a conflict of interest and it can not be permitted.
- 4) If the science doesn't support the long term sustainability of the environment in which the project is being proposed and the environments with which rely on the area of proposal, then the project should not be approved. If the project is not approved, it should not be permitted to go through.
- 5) The people who live in the surrounding area of a proposed project should receive meaningful consultation from the moment a project is conceived. These consultations should be provided in a way that are respectful and inclusive. Online consultations are not enough.
- 6) Once these points have been implemented. Please ensure they can NOT be undermined or reversed by future governments. Environments outlive a 4 year democratic cycle and it is important that we bare this in mind as we are creating laws that protect the well being of our planet and the people, plants, and animals that depend on it.
- 7) Apply the use of cutting edge technology to ensure the utmost security and long term sustainability of our environment. There is little repercussions for big businesses who break the the law. There needs to be due diligence in law enforcement and punishment that is meaningful and relevant to the business that has broken the law. For example, a small fine for a massive multinational oil corporation is NOT relevant to

it's business operations or meaningful.

Finally, good work standing up to Trudeau and the corrupt federal government. Keep it up. You have earned my vote by standing up for B.C. and following through on many of your election promises. Actions like this ensure a healthy democracy and encourage young adults such as myself to continue to vote in future elections.

=====

It's time to make industry be responsible for their mess and not the people of British Columbia. Time for government to regulate and not leave it up to industry to self police themselves and let the people of British Columbia cleanup their mess. In this day and age industry self regulating is not acceptable.

=====

It is important to ensure that environmental assessments are not a superficial attempt to rubber stamp a process in which decisions have been already made. Citizens need to have an opportunity to influence the process when public opinion goes against that of the government, and scientists and climate change specialists need their opinions respected. The influence of large corporations that stand to benefit from projects must be removed from the process entirely. Indigenous claims and opinions need to be respected.

In an era where the impacts of climate change and pollution have a huge impact on the future of our children, it is important that environmental assessment processes reflect the science of climate change, the failings of our economic system, and respect the values of our citizens

=====

As a citizen of British Columbia, I am worried about our current federal government's push towards pipelines, fracking and toxic waste sites.

We need our provincial government to have more input from scientists, reviewing projects properly with real goals to change our climate targets.

Enough failing to secure indigenous consent as well. We have to collaborate with the First Nations people and their land.

=====

We need to protect our environment, and it can't be at our expense. Companies need to be responsible for footing the bill for a cleanup. But there also needs to be huge fines for covering up, hiding, and not responding to spills immediately. When pipelines and other projects that can impact our environment negatively are proposed, this must be at the top of the list.

=====

We must all stop projects that can and have the potential to harm the enviroment.

=====

We need much more comprehensive environmental assessments. I voted for your government in hopes that you would give scientists a stronger voice and protect beautiful BC.

=====

We are one with the Eco-System, let's act like it!
First BC is unceded territory, our land, you need our consent before starting anything, unlike Trudeau. Passing through Traditional Culturally used lands that we and our Ancestors hunted, and gathered from. You don't see first Nation destroying colonial burial grounds do you? Well, you are doing that to first Nations, and continuing to do that to us! Adhere to Aboriginal Law's as your ancestors first did upon arrival to our lands.

=====

I expect the BC government to fully overhaul the environment assessment process so that it respects science, first nations rights and concerns, and is not influenced by industry stake holders. Potential projects must also consider global warming and any negative impacts a project would have in this domain.

=====

This province has become a haven for free-for-all developers of ethically and environmentally unsound practices. Oversight is minimal or non-existent and often done by the companies involved. Independent reviewers need to do the assessments on environmental impact.

The blatant disregard of indigenous concerns and treaties is despicable.

=====

I would like to see the pipelines & other projects be proposed that are a net benefit to BC & Canada and ensure that there is no special treatment for those resources that come from outside of Canada.

=====

I fully support a proper environmental review of all large projects here in BC and the full review of the current projects that did not get looked at before they started.

=====

Please keep up the good work of making a stand for a healthier environment. In this frightening time where profit for a few reigns over health for all, it's good to know our provincial government cares and has our back. In future, the stand you are taking will be seen clearly as the right one. Please don't give up

the good fight. Ensure all projects are reviewed and reject those that don't meet solid climate targets. Collaborate with First Nations in general and throw away any projects that don't meet their consent. Invite input from citizens (as you are doing here) and scientists.

=====

BC needs to be much more particular about the way that industry cares for our environment. We need to support the economy and create jobs without poisoning ourselves.

I am not a scientist or scientific writer, but as a citizen, I want to see an end to headlines of environmental disasters and corporate negligence.

Any project which has the potential to cause significant harm to the environment, including the soil and the water system; wildlife or humans needs to have a serious review. Any information received from the applicant needs to be verified, and independent experts must be consulted. Public input needs to be given serious weight- as citizens, we have the right to reject risks we don't want to take. Indigenous consent is also necessary.

Cumulative effects must be considered with regional assessments.

The system must be transparent and accessible to laymen.

These reforms must go to the farthest extremes to protect BC, and I urge you to implement the highest possible standards in BC. Many other countries have shown that industry will still thrive when tough environmental protections are in place.

=====

British Columbians must take all actions to protect our extremely precious environment. By that I mean air, salt or fresh waters, soil, forests and wildlife. We live in a paradise here. But all we have to do is look at other countries to see how easy it is to destroy what sustains us. Pollution, extinction, soil erosion, desertification and accompanying suffering and diseases are widespread. We must immediately, take control of how industry is allowed to operate in our province.

We must seek out sustainable industries and set stringent environmental guidelines. We have to look to other jurisdictions who are attempting to do this, learn from them and become a model ourselves. Then we can share with others how to have industry which respects and enhances our environment. This is not a dream, it is simple necessity.

=====

As a citizen of BC I'm delighted to be given the opportunity to participate in the BC government's review of environmental policy assessment.

It strikes me that one thing we are missing at this time is a fully transparent record of assessments put before the government, with a register of participants and outcomes.

Our children should benefit from historical records that exactly identify the parties who participate in assessment review and who rubber stamp project approvals. This way any project that ultimately destroys the environment for our children's future use will have full and transparent historical context upon which

to decision. While repercussions will be limited, at least participants might give sober second thought to their decisions and support given a transparent register / record database.

=====

Environmental assessments should be mandatory previous to any industrial project starting up regardless of the size. Once it has begun operation it is impossible to prove that it was the cause of any problems without an assessment.

Also, so long as SLAPP suits can happen no environmental protection is possible

=====

I welcome reform of environmental assessment. Currently projects like Jumbo Resort are allowed to proceed with total disregard of the impact on the grizzly bear population and wishes of local First Nations. The developer incorporated a city where no people live. How is it that this is allowed? It makes no sense to an ordinary citizen like me. Why are the wealthy people and wealthy corporations allowed to develop projects in communities where they aren't wanted. Rural BC is being destroyed and the environment jeopardized to benefit the wealthy. I voted for this to change and I sincerely hope that the NDP are committed to a change that protects the environment and the citizens of this province. Please make environmental assessment a requirement for any developments and ensure that the wishes of our First Nations are respected. Stop allowing destructive projects.

=====

At this time in the life and well being of the planet and that of its inhabitants, it would be in the best interest of all concerned if our province put CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT FIRST in all its future negotiations with potential businesses, projects, and development of every kind. We do not need more 'growth in our economy' as it seems to only mean getting richer at the expense of people, animals, plants, etc. and should let it be known that we are tough on the care of our environment. If development chooses to go else where, that is not our problem, and it probably means it can't meet the province's expectations. This province has lost so much and can't continue forever to provide all things just for the taking.

=====

Government's first responsibility is to act in the public interest. Our environment belongs to all of us. We know by now that resource industries cannot be trusted to police themselves. We must have a thorough, honest, and transparent environmental assessment process. Also, its decisions must be enforceable by law. I'm sure we all agree that we don't need another disaster like Mount Polley! There must be the political will to prevent it.

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC.

I believe we must move bravely and boldly together to navigate the current climate crisis and the massive long term impact we will have on our beautiful planet.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

I support changing our current review process. We need to ensure a sustainable future and significantly move away from fossil fuels. Impacts on Climate Change is a priority for all reviews and industries.

Please ensure that BC's environmental assessment process is rigorous, impartial, and beyond political meddling. If a project will have any impact upon any part of the natural environment in BC, there should be an environmental assessment. May these assessments truly aim to protect our waters, our land, and our air.

BC needs an environmental assessment program that has teeth: it needs to have the resources and power to accurately assess all kinds of proposals that will affect the environment, including human beings, and to effectively stop any activity that is deemed harmful to the environment. It must also be free from influence of the industries that may be causing environmental damage or pollution. It must have the power and resources to go after violators and to compel them to clean up, repair, and restore damaged environments to a healthy state.

It's time to fix B.C.'s environmental laws

From the Mount Polley mine disaster to Kinder Morgan's illegal anti-spawning fences, weak environmental oversight has made B.C. the Wild West of resource extraction. Site C ruining valuable farm land and poisoning the earth. It's time to update our laws.

this needs to change!

Address the following :

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

We want stronger environmental protection laws for BC.
Projects should not be approved if they threaten to pollute or destroy our rivers or lakes, drinking water or coast.
They should not be approved if they threaten wild salmon, orcas or other vulnerable species.
All old growth forest should be protected because so little of it is left.
Indigenous constitutional rights to give free, prior and informed consent or keep destructive mines, pipeline, dams and logging clearcuts out of their territories must be respected, and the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples should be adhered to.
Farmland should be protected because we have so little of it and we all need food.
We cannot expand fossil fuel extraction any more because we are in a climate emergency of wildfires, heatwaves, floods and insect plagues.
We actually have to wind down oil, bitumen and fracked gas and leave it in the ground to meet our international climate protection obligations.
Extraction, resource and energy corporations should not get preferential treatment over indigenous rights, all people who need clean water and food security, and a livable climate.

=====

BC needs stricter environmental guidelines -- ie clearly independent of project proponent, no exceptions to assessment of projects, high threshold of protection instead of catering to resource extractors. Allow for credible independent scientists to speak to projects proposed. All projects must be required to carry insurance to cover clean up. It is the 21st Century and we want to leave a proper home for our grandchildren's children and other living beings.

=====

Listen to scientists and citizens, and allow for rejecting projects that don't meet climate targets or receive Indigenous consent. Don't sell out the health and welfare of our people and our environment for the sake of Big Business.

=====

All projects have an environmental impact and need to be reviewed, rules implemented and followed up. Industry should not be allowed to police their projects and should have to pay for not abiding by the laws.

=====

I have been appalled by the lack of compliance and enforcement on environmental degradation that regularly occurs in my community. I am told the province doesn't provide the staff or the money to do even an adequate job in these areas. So money and increased staff needs to be a priority.

A CVRD staff person told me that when there is an environmental infraction, they look at the fines they can levy and then decide on whether to pursue the matter or not. As the province has appallingly low fines, infractions are too often ignored.

=====

We as residents, constituents, and decision makers for the future of British Columbia need a much more rigorous environmental assessment process. Relying on corporations to monitor and manage the process and police itself is contradictory to the primary goal of PROFIT. The government must use peer reviewed science and a valuation of all stakeholders in a process that can punish offenders and prevent the people of BC from being helpless victims of corporate negligence. Please put the people and future generations of British Columbians at the top of your priority list.

=====

I would like to see more oversight , industry has had a chance to self direct and failed. Environmental assessments need to be handled by unbiased groups. I don't know exactly what to suggest but I see a lot of concerning issues with unnecessary pipelines threatening our coast ! Just to mention one issue.

=====

First and foremost, large projects with the potential for environmental degradation must undergo a rigorous environmental review, with comments from both proponents and opponents, and with the right of those who oppose the project to cross examine the data that industry is using to support the project. Government should set aside research funds for independent researchers to verify industry data. Secondly, industry must not be allowed to be the only body monitoring compliance with environmental controls/potential pollutants. All environmental assessments must include the impact on climate change.

=====

Hello. As a person who was born and raised in BC, I am hoping to see a few things happen with environmental reform:

1. Let's enforce the laws we have, at a minimum. And when we have people tell us that conditions are not being met, let's force extraction companies to comply.
2. Let's make stakeholders - not company names and numbers - accountable for their actions. All too often a company will run itself into the ground, go bankrupt, and then leave environmental cleanup to the BC government and by extension the citizens. Meanwhile, the company execs simply move to another company. No. This is not OK. Let's see people held accountable for their decisions in the resource sector, rather than simply cutting and running to the next job when their decisions result in unsavoury consequences!

3. Our resources are finite. Let's start charging a reasonably high rate for them NOW. Look at Norway and their treatment of the oil industry as an example. Norway charges much higher fees/taxes/rates for resource extraction, and yet companies are still willing to work there! The idea that companies will abandon the market if we raise corporate tax rates, or stumpage fees, or environmental levies, has been proven false. Let's make sure BC get's its' share of the profits, rather than being on the hook for the cleanup!

Let's see environmental assessment put BC first, rather than multinational bottom lines.

=====

Just Do It!

For years B.C. rubber-stamped pipelines, mines, fracking and toxic waste sites with little regard for local communities. But things are shifting. Our new government is proposing a major overhaul to the way we conduct environmental reviews. Big changes on the table include:

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed

Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments

More input from citizens and independent scientists

Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets

Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

The government is accepting public comments until July 30. They need to hear from you. What else do you want to see in B.C.'s project reviews?

=====

In regards to future mega industrial projects of any kind (dams, pipelines, drill sites, factories dealing with toxic substances....). I want long term, independent environmental assessments to take top priority. This province is so rare in the health of its intact eco-systems. The time is now. I really want my child to have the same privileges of clean water,air and land as i did growing up (they are privileges but they shouldn't be). Environment first please. Thank you for your time

=====

Thank you for carrying out this public consultation. In general, the EA process must ensure that irreparable harm is not done to our ecological support system in the form of the natural world. We all depend on the services of the natural world for our survival so in a very real sense, ensuring it's sustainability is directly to our own benefit.

As a specific and timely example, new projects MUST NOT cause our climate goals to be unreachable. This would eviscerate the entire spirit and purpose of an EA.

The above specific example should not only be applicable to projects that require an EA, but all government decisions. What is the point of a democracy and a system of representatives that doesn't work to ensure the healthy continuance of it's population?

A lot is on the line here. I hope and trust that this government will do the right thing by it's people.

=====

Doctors of B C has policy supporting Health Assessments for all industrial projects in BC.
This is to benefit us all!

=====

I have been increasingly dissatisfied with British Columbia's environmental assessment process over the past decade. Relevant voices and environmental concerns — not least the climate crisis — have been paid lip service at best, and are entirely left out of the process at worst.

The process, in my view, has largely favoured industry players and lobbyists, and has in large measure excluded the very citizens it is supposed (in theory) to protect. I realize NIMBYism is a frequent problem, but by the same token not every big resource project must be pushed through. If we are going to have a clean, livable environment, we must learn to say no.

The environment is foremost a "big picture" issue, and must be looked at from that perspective. Evaluating impacts on a per-project basis, without addressing cumulative impacts, is a grave error — one which has contributed to, for example, our current, dire climate situation.

A missing factor in environmental assessment is *meaningful* Indigenous consent — not just consultation, but consent. And if that consent is not forthcoming, a willingness to forego harmful resource extraction projects. This is mostly their unceded land; let us act like it.

The environmental review regime has been largely co-opted by industry, and our province is seeing the consequences in, for example, mining spills and wild fires on a huge scale. We are suffering. It is time to give environmental assessment back to the people it is meant to protect!

=====

Our environmental assessment process requires a major overhaul. Our current process is skewed in favour of industry. We need reforms that focus on sound science and long term sustainable development and protection of publically owned natural resources. Our current system focuses on short term gain, stealing from future generations. With proper safeguards and protections in place we can green light projects that are viable long term and do not degrade irreplaceable natural systems. We need strong systems to halt development that benefits large corporations for questionable short term economic growth, while degrading biodiversity and ecosystem resilience.

We further need systems that take concrete steps for First Nations consultation. Our government has promised reconciliation. Without meaningful consultation and consideration of First Nations knowledge and needs, this promise will just be more empty words. Economic development on First Nations territory requires First Nations consent to proceed, otherwise we continue to be colonialists.

Our environmental assessment process requires local consultation on a project by project basis. Local residents know their environments better, and can point out values and needs that are often ignored without their input.

We need an environmental assessment process that looks at the impacts of past and current projects on our ecosystems, and takes into account how future projects could compound existing stresses on the environment. Development must not threaten endangered species and ecosystems, and should take pains

to prevent fragmentation of habitats for species threatened by development.
Our new environmental assessment process must consider First Nations consent, must have local input on a project by project basis, and must not sacrifice environmental resilience for economic growth.

=====

it is very important that British Columbia have strong environmental laws as well as reviews for new projects. The Mount Polley mine disaster still has not been cleared up. The Quesnel River continues to be very dirty looking. The salmon spawn in this river and prior to the spill the Quesnel Lake was the largest pristine lake in the world. Existing projects should also be frequently monitored.

=====

I support any reasonable measures to strengthen environmental reviews. Resource extraction and infrastructure projects such as pipelines require stronger scrutiny, not just with regard to their local impact but also in respect of overall values such as climate targets and buy-in by First Nations. KM expansion should not be allowed to go ahead, nor should "New Prosperity" mine in the Tsil'quotin, to cite two prominent examples.

=====

You cannot rely on consultants working for industry to do environmental assessments impartially. They are working for industry and have a financial interest to see their industrial partners succeed. The government must have in house expertise and staff to independently assess all environmental assessments.

=====

Now is the time to fix the Liberal biased rules around environmental assessments to make sure that we do not have another Lake Shownigan or Mt. Polley disaster happen in BC.

It is time to put in place measures that include environmental risk assessments that are done by independent scientists.

It is time that the review includes input from citizens whose home will be impacted, and whose business may be impacted by spills and environmental breaches, not if they happen, but when they happen.

It is time that the government update and put into place measures that will protect our multi-billion dollar tourism industry and protect the jobs of our citizens who are employed in it. It is time that the government ensure that projects that will keep us from reaching our climate targets, and projects that do not ensure the rights of our Indigenous communities to secure clean drinking water and continue with their way of life, due to decimated fish stocks taking away their livelihood, be rejected.

Now is the time.

Pass legislation that will ensure that these projects are not passed if they are likely to cost the province to lose tourism dollars, and jobs, which will negatively impact our economy.

It is up to you! Do you stand by your campaign promise to do everything in your power to protect our coastline, our wildlife and our land, or do you cave in to offshore and foreign investments, and other provinces to allow for disastrous projects such as kindermorgan?

Step up to the plate and do what is right. Fix the environmental laws and save our beautiful province for our children and our future generations. It is the right thing to do!

=====

It is time for a proper Environmental assessment reform. Assessments should be completely independent of the resource industry. Future generations are the ones who will be living with increasing pollution that we do nothing to prevent.

=====

I know it takes time and the industry doesn't want to wait. But what the industry wants isn't always the most important aspect of what the government needs to do. When it comes to assessments, determining environmental impacts, etc. it is the governments job to look after the interests of BC residents for the long term. So I would prefer the government spent time getting proper assessments done on mines, especially if the company is wanting to expand an older mine that the aging infrastructure wasn't built for. We definitely do NOT want a repeat of the Mt. Polley disaster. I would prefer the government to spend more time on environmental assessments and consulting more than just the industry before approving projects. I would like to get it right the first time, not have to try and recover and/or fix a disaster later. AND most importantly, I wish governments would realize that unlimited growth isn't a good thing. There is a finite amount of resources and space. Unlimited growth isn't sustainable, or desirable. If you want an example of unlimited growth, look at cancer cells. Why would anyone want to emulate cancer cells? It usually doesn't turn out well in the long run.

=====

Please put the rights of all British Columbian especially our indigenous people to have a clean liveable environment first and foremost. . Resource extraction should only go ahead when and if NO damage will be done to our air, water and food supplies. What good is short term economic gain when we have destroyed our environment?

=====

Please ensure these points are included in any new legislation regarding environmental reviews:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent. Also include stricter penalties for poor construction of dams (Mt. Polley comes to mind) and other careless acts towards the environment and local populations.

=====

On 31 MAR 2014, there was a LNG explosion in Plymouth, WA, which forced 100's to evacuate their homes and there were five injured workers. Employees saw a large ball of fire, as large pieces of metal flew by them. Some employees were knocked off their feet. The public felt the explosion six miles away and the distance between the Woodfibre LNG plant and Squamish is 3.7 miles, so the terminal has to be terminated, because it is too close to residential areas. The Tilbury LNG Project (Westpac) is too close to

Richmond and Delta.

Canada has no LNG tanker safety regulations, so the Assessment Office should write up some regulations for the safe operations of LNG tankers for British Columbia. The Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators (SIGTTO) recommends a safety hazard zone of 3.5 km's. See the video entitled "New Video shows serious dangers posed by LNG tankers". For information, see the website, www.lngtankersafety.org. The distance between Horseshoe Bay and Bowen Island is 2 km's, which means the LNG tankers will transit within 1 km of Horseshoe Bay, which is too close for comfort. The residential areas of Howe Sound should be , at least, 3.5 km's away from the LNG tanker transit route.

No LNG tankers for southwest BC. The waterways of the Gulf/San Juan Islands are not suited to be international shipping lanes for super tankers. The LNG tanker route through the Haro Strait is too close to Victoria.

The Woodfibre plant is in a life threatening location.

=====

I am very pleased that our environmental assessment system is under review. I believe that when we use out natural resources we should do so intelligently, gaining as much economic value from our actions as possible and minimizing the damage we do.

These are items that I want to see in out new environmental assessment process:

- Review by independent scientists
- More input from citizens and collaboration with First Nations
- Ensuring more projects are reviewed
- Rejections of projects that would make B.C. or Canada's climate targets unattainable.

=====

We endorse the government's plans to overhaul environmental rules and make them tougher. From open pen fish farms to fracking too much leeway has been allowed permitting the build up of toxic waste in the ocean and tailing ponds on land.

=====

More strident environmental assessments **MUST** be done in British Columbia. Industries doing self assessment and examinations continue to turn a blind eye creating environmental catastrophes such as at Mt. Polley. Pipelines and continued resource extraction must have Indigenous and local communities consultations. **PLEASE** change policy before it is too late!

=====

I am writing in support of a major overhaul to the way we conduct environmental reviews. It is truly a tragedy to watch our province being used as an industrial wasteland with no regard for the future. Mount Polly Kinder Morgan, Fracking for Natural Gas destroying our precious fresh ground water. Please put the health of this provinces natural assets back in the hands of the people who care.

Please have all projects reviewed with a solid commitment and action to collaborate with First Nations to

lead assessments.

More input is required from citizens and independent scientists.

Reject projects that do not meet our climate targets.

Our indigenous peoples have suffered for far too long at the hands of uncaring industry. Securing

Indigenous consent is essential to the health and wellbeing for all our relations.

Thank You for taking positive and progressive action so future generations may live in a healthy way.

Our 8 year old's are watching and have dreams for their tomorrow's.

=====

Here are the changes I would like to see:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I want to see our environment protected, as what's been allowed to happen to date is wrong and environmentally unsustainable to say the least.

I'd also like to add to the proposed recommendations that the government resume managing and regulating the forestry operations vs. allowing the companies to self-regulate. On Vancouver Island the forests are being clear cut at an alarming rate and I feel strongly that our changing weather pattern with hot, dry summers has been the direct result of it. One only has to study what has happened - and is happening right now - in Buenos Aires with their extreme water shortages that have been attributed directly to the destruction of the Amazon forests. Trees are vitally important in regulating our weather patterns on the Island. One has only to travel to Port Alberni to witness the massive amount of logging that has happened over the past number of years. It's truly sad and so disheartening to think that no one seems to care. Will this government step up to the plate and make the changes necessary for our forests to survive and our water supply to be ensured going forward?

All voices need to be heard when projects are being proposed. We all share this province and we are all stewards of the land, indigenous or not.

=====

I have lived in BC for 50 of my 77 years. In that time bird populations have decreased, frogs have disappeared, forests have been diminished by pests, fires and logging, and the orca populations are in trouble. Also our local Comox Glacier, (actually an ice cap) has now gone to a smear. This ice-cap has been here for thousands of years, as it features in the local indigenous legends as Queneesh, the White Whale, who saved the people of the coast from the Great Flood. In other words, our environment has changed, and we MUST protect what is left if our progeny is to survive. Please enact legislation to stop more fossil fuel extraction, to protect the land from desecration, to include the indigenous people in decisions that affect them, and encourage alternative power sources.

=====

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments to this review.

1. First, and most important is to not approve projects that will make it impossible to meet our GHG target. Any project that will increase emissions must fit within a credible overall GHG reduction plan and include adequate mitigation measures.
2. The assessment and any mitigation plan should be based on input from independent, qualified scientists, not developed by the proponent or a professional contracted by the proponent. The proponent, anyone directly compensated by the proponent, or anyone with a financial interest in the project, would be in an unacceptable conflict of interest (cf the Shawnigan Lake contaminated material dumping fiasco). The proponent should fund the review to an appropriate level but the review should be conducted by an independent body.
3. First Nations need to be included in the assessment; ideally it would be a joint review but in any case their concerns have to be addressed to their satisfaction.
4. Citizen concerns need to be adequately addressed.
5. No project that has the potential to have significant environmental impact, including upstream and down stream effects should be excluded from a review.

=====

I want BC to be a leader in the environment. Political right wing seems to be gaining more and more momentum (see Ontario). I want my government to care about reconciliation with the indigenous people. I want them to care about our southern resident whales. I want them to stop old growth logging (absolutely no need). I want my government to care about people AND to care for the environment. Time to stop picking one over the other. Please.

=====

Protect our priceless environment now! Honour the Reconciliation promotes and honour Indigenous Consent Now!

=====

We need a government that cares about protecting the environment, and stopping resource extraction and pipelines. We need honest government to prioritize health, quality of life, and human rights. We must reverse global warming before it's too late.

=====

When it comes to the environment the public should be consulted and given a public vote on any and all decisions made, and that is considered law and put into law by public vote and not by politicians.

=====

Just because we're located in what used to be the Wild West doesn't mean we want it to be a free for all now. - Please keep the environmental and social impacts of greed involved in major projects limited by

strengthening the processes involved in environmental reviews.

Also, let's waste less time on projects that are no-brainers to reject due to them contributing too negatively to our ability to meet our climate targets - or those that fail to secure consent of indigenous stakeholders.

=====

Mr. Horgan, I trust that your government and your Green party colleagues want to start putting the needs of British Columbians ahead of corporations. Ensuring that BC has a rigorous environmental process that incorporates First Nations rights, community needs and perspectives, and conducts its assessment with BC's carbon pollution reduction targets at the centre is essential to protecting our land, water, air, oceans, wildlife, and everything we love about BC. I voted for your government because I was sick and tired of seeing the BC Liberals sell our wonderful province's natural heritage off for corporations to exploit in exchange for power. I voted for real change and so that more citizen voices could be heard. Please fulfil your promise and overhaul the EA review legislation and process. We will support you in this endeavour.

=====

I support our government taking control of the environmental assessments.
This is one of the main reasons we have supported our NDP government in the past election.

=====

Thank you for listening to the people of British Columbia. What is important to me moving forward is that we:

- a) ensure that more projects are actually reviewed, rather than being pushed along the pipe (so to speak)
 - b) reject projects that would negatively affect our climate targets
 - c) reject projects that fail to receive Indigenous consent
- and that we
- d) get more input from citizens and independent scientists.

Let's avoid the disaster that was Mt Polley, and build strong environmental oversight into our system.

=====

I'm very glad BC is reviewing the environmental assessment process. This is much needed. I call on the revised process to:

- reject projects where upstream and downstream climate impacts are incompatible with the Paris Agreement
- require Indigenous consent
- use independent scientific evidence and peer review
- hold public hearings

=====

It is the same as in a business that is trying to protect workers.... if the fine is big enough and enforceable, there will never ever be infractions unless the person wants to go to jail.

Our biggest problem is not making rules, but enforcing them.

This is because almost every corporate entity has the attitude that they can and will get away with it. Whatever the rule is... if it costs them money, they will work towards spending less. In whatever way they can.

So, how do you teach corporate power and money grabbers integrity? Just going philosophical, but that is it, in a nutshell.

So, devise a way that 'user'! Hah hah pays, user of the system pays for the system. The very one they are trying to beat!

=====

BC needs stricter environmental assessments and those need to be done by unbiased and properly trained officials.

Please fix BC s environmental assessment process.

=====

I work for an environmental consultant company and have seen first hand how our clients will try to pressure us to come to the conclusion they want and I have felt the reality of how fear of competition drawing clients away from us puts pressure on our company. I believe our company stays as neutral as we can but I have seen other consulting companies give in to client biases.

Industry cannot be the ones hiring environmental consultants to report on projects they clearly have a bias about. There has to be a separation here. This may mean the government charging the companies a fee to hire less biased companies who bid on the project or who are on a rotational consultant list.

EIAs can seem bureaucratic but they are necessary to gather information to make informed decisions.

=====

There need to be open assessments and REVIEW including from INDEPENDENT scientists. It is a disgrace to allow corporate bullies to cause permanent damage and that INTEGRITY has been sold out.

=====

I wish to add my voice to those who are asking the government to take back the review process and put it in the hands of our representative government. Industries by nature have biases to help their own selves, sometimes at the expense of the residents of the province. It makes no sense at all that they control the oversight process. I applaud and encourage the NDP government's actions towards reversing that trend.

=====

It is our responsibility to have environmental laws with teeth,
laws that can be rigorously enforced:
for today's and future
generations.

=====

I would like the provincial govt to re-instate tougher environmental reviews, and permit restrictions.

It is imperative that all citizens, especially first nations, those directly impacted be allowed to voice concerns. ,Scientific data and findings and reviews must be presented in an open and transparent way so all have access. The final decision should involve peoples from a broad spectrum of expertise, and society.

=====

I appreciate this opportunity to contribute my thoughts to his process.

Not having expertise in this area myself,
I'll limit myself to two wishes. First, I would wish to see assessments done by highly respected scientists in their field - regardless of political affiliation. I would like to see this whole process overseen by a multi-party panel with nonpartisanship and scientific integrity held as a high priority.

And secondly, I would wish our First Nations to have a reserved seat at the table. Environmental assessments must consider the social and cultural impacts that are rightly entwined in Aboriginal perspectives on environment.

=====

Environmental assessments, Indigenous consent, and just labour standards should be three priorities in evaluating resource extraction. the final project should respect these concerns and ultimately benefit those who live in the province.

=====

I fully support the proposed long overdue of BC's environmental assessment program. We need to ensure that proposed projects are properly reviewed. There needs to be collaboration and joint assessment with First Nations, and more room for meaningful input from citizens and independent scientists. We have to ensure that our climate targets are not by-passed. Projects of specific concern to me with respect to targets and care of the environment are fracking and oil transportation. In general we need to be proactive in our stewardship of how we use our natural resources, both renewable and non- renewable to ensure our environment remains resilient and sustainable for future generations.

=====

Our governments must charge the non-compliant companies and their managers and CEOs...and charge 'em lots. Our governments should manage and profit from all industries. Private industries are often pirate swindles in the long run.

=====

I am heartened that you intend to update our laws regarding environmental oversight of new projects in BC. Please be sure to:

- consult with independent scientists,
- reject projects that have not got Indigenous consent,
- have a systematic and detailed review of EVERY project that will have an environmental impact
- collaborate with First Nations on the project assessments

It's time for BC to be the leader of all the provinces in terms of strong environmental oversight, particularly given the track Ontario is now on.

=====

Please, please strengthen environmental laws. Don't let industry self-assess!

=====

My name is [redacted], and I am a secondary counsellor. I have lived in BC my entire life, and I am deeply concerned about environmental issues that affects our coast, our forests, and the province as a whole.

Many argue that environmental is subservient to the economy, that when jobs and industry are at stake, the environment must take a back seat. I am strongly opposed to this mindset, for without a healthy, strong, and sustainable environment, we will have not an economy nor any industry. We need to focus our attention, money, and research on renewable energies, not green-lighting pipelines, digging new mines, fracking or other environmentally damaging activities. And yes, I would be will to pay more for my energy as a result. I know many BCers that would. But, in truth, I do not think it has to come to that: environment at an increased cost to denizens. Rather, investing in new energies can be lucrative and financial forward-thinking. Doing so will help build a stronger BC economy for tomorrow.

We also need to put our money where our mouth is and involve First Nations meaningful in discussion. (Rather than simply giving lip-service, letting them have their say, and then discounting/disregarding their concerns.)

Let's follow the advice of the scientists. Let's think long-range about keeping the economy (and the environment) going for our children's children, rather the just the immediate future. Let's implement changes and make decisions that actively take us close to BC's climate targets.

I urge you to prioritize the environment, rather than industry, in upcoming decisions. Let our legacy be one that we can be proud of.

=====

Thank you for taking environmental concerns seriously and for carrying out changes necessary to keep our environment healthy for we humans and all of nature.

=====

BC needs strong environmental standards to assess industrial projects in this province. The project proposals need to be actually reviewed. Joint assessments can be done in collaboration with First Nations, with more input from citizens and independent scientists. BC's climate targets are crucial, so projects have to be rejected if they ruin the ability to meet those targets. Projects that don't get consent from Indigenous peoples should be rejected, too. I support these changes. Citizen input should also be invited and listened to.

=====

New laws that strongly protect our Air, Water, Oceans and Land, with approval required from Citizens (Referendums), Independent Scientist and First Nations.

=====

Please make sure that the following ideas are actually considered in the future. Also, let us be active considering projects that that are environmentally sound.
Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

Please ensure that any project that seeks extraction of natural resources must undergo a thorough scientific and environmental review, to include calculation of costs to carbon footprint. Any company/corporation must clear the reviews and also be responsible for all clean up; putting the extraction area back to clean, natural state. The company/ corporation must ensure environmental protection of species habitat and especially of air and water.
The company/corporation must post a comprehensive bond to ensure environment and human lives are protected.
All Community members directly affected by the proposed extraction project including First Nations must have direct voice during consultation/review process.
Resource development must not be at the expense of a sacrificed environment due to shoddy and careless extraction methods. No economic gain is worth the loss of a species or ecosystem.
Our natural environment must support us all for generations.
Thank you in advance for doing all you can to provide responsible stewardship of BCs natural environment and our collective resources.

=====

Please please please! : put in place environmental impact assessments which are required by law and binding depending on the findings, for ANY infrastructure, industrial, or mining project

thank you! The future of this beautiful land depends on your wise and gentle stewardship!

=====

please consider public input into your decisions

=====

I am writing to say that I wish your proposed major overhaul would make certain that companies are compliant. That would mean having inspectors checking on what is actually happening - the Mount Polley mine disaster and the fish farms in the ocean are two that come to mind.

Please have all projects reviewed by independent experts. Do not depend on the proponent for the information.

Take advice from locals-the Peace River Valley is prone to slides and so far there has been no bedrock found for the Site C dam.

Do say NO to projects that would not allow us to meet our climate targets.

Do secure Indigenous consent after proper consultation.

=====

Proposed projects should be broadly and thoroughly reviewed. Experts and the public should be invited to participate. Special attention should be paid to Indigenous knowledge and wishes. Reviews should include cumulative impacts, and accordingly, small-scale projects should not be exempted.

Laws and regulations need to be enforced, by government officers. Penalties should be substantial.

To be approved, projects should fight climate change, or at least not increase its effects.

To be approved, projects should be agreed to by First Nations affected.

Clear and meaningful laws and regulations, enforced, could well limit applications to proposals that are environmentally sound and that respect First Nations, saving time and energy that could be used for better purposes, and reducing conflict.

=====

Please Mr. HOrgan, live up to your title and the promises that we trusted.

Listen to the First Nations; listen to science; listen to the members of your province.

We said no and continue to say no to Kinder Morgan. Please listen

=====

This is what is important to me: about environmental reviews:
Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

Thank you for your intention to move forward on all these issues.

=====

Please do everything possible to prevent the type of environmental disaster that Mount Polley dam burst represents!

I would like to see the following:-

- *Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- *Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- *More input from citizens and independent scientists
- *Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- *Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

Our environment is too precious to put at risk!

=====

I am fully supportive of your move to overhaul BC's environmental laws. Not only that, I urge you to make sure the resources to enforce them are quickly made available.
All development projects of a substantive nature should be subject to full environmental impact assessment prior to their being approved. The natural environment has a limited capacity to recover from damage, but that is often slow. In other words, "they aren't making any more of it" in our lifetimes, so we must take care of what we have.
Collaboration with First Nations must take place in the assessment process. Input from thoughtful citizens and independent scientists must not only be allowed, it must be facilitated.
Projects that are not consistent with BC's climate targets need to be modified or rejected outright as should projects that do not receive secure indigenous consent.
We, the citizens of BC are relying on you to make these changes and to bring the 'wild west' attitude to development to a close.

=====

These are the kinds of safeguards I would like to see in place:
Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists

Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

A proposal for a project which has any potential for local, regional, provincial, national or global environmental damage must have an environmental and human health impact assessment conducted by government scientists, not by industry employees. Any communication between government and industry must be totally transparent and publicly reported in a timely fashion. The province should increase involvement in federally controlled projects (such the shipment of US thermal coal through BC ports which will harm local residents).

Citizens' commonwealth must not be squandered for private profit - ie: mined resources such as tar sands, minerals, forests and ocean resources.

Industry externalization of costs (such as pollution, damage to fisheries, etc) must not be allowed.

All BC voters should have notification of such proposed projects in a timely fashion. Indigenous involvement in the assessment and approval must be conducted.

The precautionary principle must be strictly adhered to.

Possible impacts on the seventh generation must be seriously considered.

=====

The main things that need to be included in an overhaul of B.C.'s environmental assessments in my opinion are greater consultation with communities directly impacted by ANY infrastructure project. Particularly in regards to indigenous communities. Under section 35 of the constitution, we have a duty to consult with indigenous communities before going ahead with development projects on their territory. Under the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (which ought to be adopted as Canadian LAW) indigenous peoples must CONSENT before development of major infrastructure projects on their unceded land. B.C. could be doing a lot more to respect the rights of indigenous communities. MUCH more consultation is owed to these communities. We must also make sure that any projects proposed must be in line with meeting our climate targets and we must have a science and EVIDENCE based approach to determining that. All voices have a seat at the table but we must listen to scientists FIRST before we listen to lobbyists and private business interests. I wish the government of B.C. all the best in reviewing this public consultation and I hope they will deliver a greatly improved environmental assessment process. My vote in the next election may depend on it...

=====

It with sincerity and deep concern that I am writing here with my comments toward Environmental Protection.

I believe that environmental reviews are essential and need to be reviewed and changed in the province of BC.

Lack of thorough environmental assessments have caused disasters like Mount Polley, the allowance of Kinder Morgan pipelines to be built, Site C Dam and its devastating environmental impacts and impacts to First Nation communities and ancestral lands, (not to mention treaty rights being violated), and many other instances of environmental degradation and risk to human and species' health.

I'd like to see more projects being reviewed, and being reviewed by independent experts and independent scientists, and NOT reviewed by biased professionals within industry or within corporations who profit from these projects.

Thorough collaboration and prior and informed consent with Indigenous leaders and communities needs to be a leading priority. True reconciliation (and what has become now a tainted word, a tainted notion and lip-service and broken promises of reconciliation), Indigenous consultation is essential and in my opinion a top priority. It is imperative start to align with the recommendations set out from the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Additionally, these revised environmental review processes need to have input from citizens, as well as Indigenous communities.

I sincerely urge this government to reject any project that do not support B.C's climate targets. Anything less than meeting our climate targets should be 'off the table' and not even considered, let alone even brought to an environmental review. And if such a review proves that the project does not contribute to BC meeting its climate targets than all such projects should be automatically denied.

I support rejecting projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent, even if they pass in supporting climate targets.

I sincerely hope you consider my, and other citizen comments as part of your public engagement on this issue.

=====

I want the communities affected to be part of the decision process. I want the government to think about the next 1000 years not the next 10.

=====

The consultation with local communities and First Nations should be first on the agenda. No project can even begin until these matters are settled. Corporations should not be allowed to proceed in any way until the environmental assessment is completed with all parties weighing in on the matter. The interest of the environment and the communities comes first.

=====

please have a citizen consultation including independent scientists private citizens and first nations that oversee all climate targets are met and securing environmental and ecological needs are adhered to and reviewing of projecta actually happens

=====

From the Mount Polley mine disaster to Kinder Morgan's illegal anti-spawning fences, weak environmental oversight has made B.C. the Wild West of resource extraction. It's time to update our laws.

For years B.C. rubber-stamped pipelines, mines, fracking and toxic waste sites with little regard for local communities. But things are shifting. Our new government is proposing a major overhaul to the way we conduct environmental reviews. Big changes on the table include:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I am one of the vast array of inhabitants of the Salish Sea – most of whom have no means of providing input into maintaining a healthy, liveable, sustainable environment. Climate change affects all species and continued extraction of fossil fuels exacerbates this world-wide crisis. BC needs to reform its environmental legislation.

Environmental assessment laws must be stringent, be independently assessed [peer reviewed by scientists and experts in the field, and include indigenous-led studies], and allow full and meaningful , early and ongoing participation by the general public – with funding to support the process.

It is essential that projects that fail to meet important legal criteria [indigenous rights, climate change test] be rejected – and NO projects be exempted from environmental assessment

Make an assessment law that requires decision-makers to select the option [from among reasonable alternatives] that BEST upholds Indigenous title and rights and protects the values of cultural, social, ecological, and economic health.

=====

Please honour First Nations rights regarding environmental assessments pertaining to pipeline expansions, eg Kinder Morgan

=====

In addition to ensuring any project with a significant potential impact is reviewed and meaningful collaboration with First Nations on joint assessments, I would require far more public and independent scientific input. Projects that would threaten greenhouse gas emission targets and fail to achieve indigenous consent would be rejected out of hand and alternatives requested.

=====

I am so grateful for the stand that this government has taken against the pipeline. If our coastline is polluted with bitumen, no amount of money can put it right again.

I completely support an overhaul of the environmental approval process that got us here. I would just add that BC needs a better way of making its economic case for clean coastlines on CBC, CTV, and other media - I fear our fellow Canadians only understand Alberta's perspective.

=====

Sorry, I somehow posted before I had my thoughts in order.

I understand that an overhaul of BC's environmental assessment process is in the offing. I've heard that the government proposes to ensure all projects are reviewed, and by disinterested experts; that First Nations co-leadership will be in place for all reviews; that independent scientists will be consulted and their opinions respected; that projects that do not contribute in a positive way to BC's climate targets will be refused; that no project will proceed without full Indigenous consent. If this is indeed so, I heartily support this approach.

If this government came through with these proposals, they would have my vote in the next election for sure.

=====

BC needs fully independent oversight of all resource extraction projects. In the past industry has been policing itself, leading to under reporting of the number and extent of spills. There is a clear conflict of interest when industry is left to 'police' itself. There must be an oversight plan that involves local communities, especially Aboriginal people, in the implementation and monitoring of a rigorous program of standards and enforcement.

=====

I'm not familiar with the current state of provincial environmental law but the big changes you're proposing sound good. I stand with indigenous leaders on the environment and every time I do, I hear "this is what reconciliation looks like". So I'd like to make sure that assessments look like that too.

Every project assessed needs to take into account its effects on climate change. BC needs to take leadership in ensuring that this happens - beginning with the Kinder Morgan expansion.

=====

Every project up for review should take into account its impact on the southern resident killer whales. They are under threat of extinction and an iconic part of British Columbia. When an apex predator is under such extreme stress it means the whole ecosystem is in need of protection and means must be taken to do that and ensure that these very special whales continue to live and thrive in the Salish Sea.

=====

In my opinion, resource extractors and other industrial operations should be responsible to maintain the environmental conditions as per the original natural conditions, not bring it down to some lower minimum standard. The corporation should be responsible to fix their "accidents" and failure to meet standards.

Corporate executives should have some personal liability when it is shown that they have willingly varied from reasonable legal expectations. Too many are getting wealthy using poor standards and practices.

Corporations should not have more rights than individuals.

=====

B. C. does not need projects that are created by other provinces so they do not have to suffer the consequences of bad decisions.

As citizens of B. C. , tired of paying for clean-up by big mining , big oil and other so -called powerful corps. Also, stop the roughshod treatment of Native lands . They have the final say what happens to their land and to speak up against their leaders who wish to sell them out.

Come B. C. govt. , stop the dangerous actions and pursue those who do them.

=====

I grew up surrounded by polluted water. Simply wading in Lake Ontario or Lake Erie could and did cause horrible rashes or even blood poisoning. The Humber River and the Don River in the heat of the summer stank unbearably. By the late sixties people had had enough and demanded the lakes and rivers be cleaned up. What could be cleaned was at tax payers expense. The industries that had created the mess got a free ride and never paid a dime for the clean up! For some reason Canadians would not insist men clean up their own mess. I say men because from the fifties through until the nineties industry was owned ,operated, and employed men! As was all government and law!

Please please insist industrie take a responsible role in keeping our environment healthy, clean air, clean water!

=====

I urge you to carry out the recommendations set out in "A Blueprint for Revitalizing Assessment in British Columbia", by West Coast Environmental Law, Ecojustice, the Environmental Law Centre of the UVic and CELL Pacific Centre for Environmental Law and Litigation. This is a "high-level vision of a progressive new approach to environmental assessment in BC as well as key changes needed to make it happen". Make BC's environmental assessment one to be proud of.

=====

When conducting environmental reviews, I would like to see:

- more input from independent scientists to be considered
 - clear provisions and responsibilities for potentially disastrous events y produced by the implementation of the projects
- =====

I have watched as disasters like Mount Polley have occurred. Unfortunately, relying on professionals being paid by the promoters of these projects results in biased studies. The penalty for conflict of interest on these kinds of studies does not prevent these disasters. The clean up is in many ways impossible to complete and the societal costs far outweigh any potential gain in terms of jobs or increased tax flow.

A robust and independent study is required for these projects. A promise to throw tax money at the problem is not an answer. A well documented plan costed to include environmental and societal costs must be in place before the projects are allowed to proceed.

One societal cost that is rarely considered is the cost of remote jobs that superficially pay well but end up separating families --leading to family breakdown and divorce. When evaluating jobs, a local job that supports families is far superior to the high paying but soul destroying jobs that lead to mental breakdowns and other medical and social stresses.

=====

I enthusiastically support the West Coast Environmental Law recommendations to be included in the proposed new British Columbia Environmental Assessment framework.

The Environmental Assessment framework for British Columbia must set a standard provincially as well as show the way for the world. A new value system must be established, taught and learned.

A strong and strongly enforced BC Environmental Assessment framework must strive to provide the foundation for reevaluating an unsustainable value system.

"Either define the moment or the moment will define you." Walt Wittman

=====

Weak environmental oversight has reigned supreme in the past and it's time things change in B.C. B.C. needs to:

Ensure more projects are actually reviewed, with stringent oversight and laws.

Strong penalties for individuals and commercial enterprises that ignore the laws and regulations.

Require companies to clean up after themselves, so not leave toxic waste sites for communities to have to pay to clean up.

More input from citizens and independent scientists.

Allow communities to reject projects that they feel will be a threat to the land, water, livelihood of people and animals, without legal repercussions.

Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent.

Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets.

Communities or individuals would not be responsible for financial compensation to corporate interests if they claim that they lost revenue due to environmental laws/regulations.

=====

Please introduce new environmental laws for B.C. Projects such as pipelines need to be assessed by independent scientists regarding environmental impact of our air, water, and land. Please help our commitment to reducing pollution from fossil fuels and help introduce clean, sustainable, renewable energy immediately. Please work cooperatively with First Nations to protect "Beautiful B.C." Listen to concerned citizens who care about the future of our children and grandchildren in regards to having a clean environment, which includes our streams, rivers, lakes, oceans, estuaries, land, and air. Fix B.C.'s environmental laws.

=====

The role of government is to oversee the security of the "common good" and not to allow businesses to reap windfall profits by avoiding the cost of repairing nature after they leave; Eg. Pooley dam, Expo 86 site, and Tsolum River Copper mine.
Do your job, strengthen and enforce environmental law.

=====

In all cases the directly affected must be heard. Such a situation as the continuing effluents from Mt. Polley is criminal, and a gov't that permits it is itself criminal.
I've been employed to do environmental work for corporations and I can attest that they do not care as long as they are not caught. Consequently, I suggest that a vast increase in resources oriented environmental investigators is required.

=====

Environmental assessment of resource extraction and transportation projects should foreground the following principles:

- consistency of the project with effective climate action, and the transitioning towards a lower-carbon economy
- rights of Indigenous peoples to meaningful participation in decisions affecting their territories
- evidence and input from affected communities and publics, and independent scientific experts
- an assessment of the amount of public subsidies, and of positive and negative externalities, entailed by the project
- internalization of costs (e.g. land remediation) that are too often borne by communities and taxpayers; companies should be required to cover such costs
- the relative contribution of the project to permanent jobs within BC
- a level playing field for advocacy for or against the project, e.g. spending limits for promotion and advertising (a negative example is the NEB allowing Kinder Morgan to collect an additional \$132 million from its customers, to seedfund its proposal for TMX)
- a reasonably low threshold for the scale of projects requiring review

=====

It's time to fix B.C.'s environmental laws
From the Mount Polley mine disaster to Kinder Morgan's illegal anti-spawning fences, weak environmental oversight has made B.C. the Wild West of resource extraction. It's time to update our laws.

For years B.C. rubber-stamped pipelines, mines, fracking and toxic waste sites with little regard for local communities.

But things are shifting because you, our provincial government, are proposing a major overhaul to the way we conduct environmental reviews.

I am not an expert on what is needed to make this right, but expect big changes. Please include strong measures to address the following:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments

- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

We need to follow Ireland and other countries who have set stricter standards and limits and are instead encouraging renewables and protection of water. Thank you for caring and please stop kinder Morgan.

=====

It is way past time that our environment has been sacrificed to big industry's desire for a quick buck. Our elected officials have been quick to receive payoffs from these industries! Oil and mining have created huge water pollution problems.....fresh water is our most valuable and renewable resource, fish farms and upstream habitat destruction are causing our salmon stocks to crash...a resource that quickly renews itself if given a chance.

Oil spills and mine tailing are not worth the risks we are forced to accept. Industries must be held responsible for each and every problem they create.

Investments in clean, renewable green energy are were I would like to see my tax dollars go. We need independent environmental reviews not industry funded shills. We also need politicians to support the science and if errors are made the should be ones that have created good not destruction.

=====

I live in British Columbia; a region which, despite much development , still retains such natural beauty. It attracts a huge tourism industry related to this. I would very much hope to see environmental assessment which is focused on preserving this natural beauty; which is truly protective . We need assessments which take account of human error and simply don't allow projects which could have even a remote chance of disaster.

Humanity has wreaked enough damage on our environment. It is time to change direction and look more to preservation and , if at all possible; restoration.

Thank you

=====

We need to more carefully assess environmental impact, and require that the company set aside funds to clean up when they are done, and leave the money in trust with the government. the way a tenant pays a damage deposit, which can be reclaimed if there is no damage done.

=====

I commend the BC government for overhauling the environmental assessment procedure for determining the impact of any proposed industrial project, no matter what size, that comes before the government for approval. It is imperative that the process become transparent, with the assessments accessible online. Indigenous peoples must have direct involvement in the the decision making in environmental

assessments. The experts that produce the reports in the assessment MUST be independent from both the government, whatever level, and the proponent. Sustainability is the ultimate criteria overlaying all other concerns and conditions. The big picture stretches out to planetary needs so that our commitments to national and international environmental agreements and regulations must be adhered to and cannot be overruled. Public input has great validity when it comes from years of experience in the region concerned. Simple process to determine environmental impact simply doesn't work.... It is a complex procedure that cannot cut corners but should be clear so that any proponent is not kept hanging on for years and years. That is not healthy or fair either.

=====

Please ensure the safety of our irreplaceable natural environment by improving environmental reviews. We need to ensure more projects are reviewed in collaboration with Indigenous leadership. Independent scientists need to be heard. Our climate targets should be a determining factor in project approval, as should Indigenous consent. Do not let another Mount Polley happen under your watch.

=====

I think industry should be responsible for committing to better tactics in environmental measures there has been too many “ accidents “ and we cannot afford to have our beautiful province affected anymore. We live in one of the most beautiful places on the planet and i myself want it to stay that way forever. If industry had there way we would clear cut all the forrests and have oil mines on every property we as British Columbians want our say and we want our indiginus peoples say to be heard loud and clear. No more pipelines dams or anything unless it is highly scrutinized by a good elected saftey commitee.

=====

When new pipelines and other projects are proposed, my primary concern is that First Nations communities must be consulted. If all affected communities do not give free, prior, and informed consent, there should be no development.
Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts.

=====

Please implement stronger environmental laws. This includes pre-construction environmental assessments, ongoing operations and end of project life cleanup. I'm particularly concerned about the business strategy of operating until bankrupt and leaving the cleanup to the taxpayer.

=====

I feel very strongly that we need stronger environmental protection laws that would invite REAL input from independent scientists, indigenous groups and citizens. We need laws with teeth that would prosecute companies and their executives for polluting, damaging, or interfering with our environment and all the creatures that depend on it for life. We need protection from another Mt. Polley and from fracking!

=====

Please take this opportunity to tighten the provincial environmental review process to ensure that future projects are actually reviewed; and that both human & environmental costs are factored into the decision. These decisions having been weighted with the advantage to corporate money making for far too long with tax payers paying the price for clean up costs and climate chaos. Its time for much tighter oversight, regulation and enforcement that includes a polluter pay philosophy. The fact that tax payers are cleaning up the mess at Mount Polley is a disgrace and a primary reason why people are giving up on governments.

=====

Get all mining, oil and gas, water related projects proper independent reviews.....scrap all liberal/Conartist regulations and rules....

=====

My perspective on this situation is that, all of the resources of this province belong to the people of the province, so that puts the provincial government in the role of overseer/protector of the peoples assets, not the owner of them. Oh my, how socialist of me!

Following from this perspective it then behooves the government of the day to ensure there are rigorous assessment processes for all projects that are proposed, which will include input from First Nations, residents and citizens plus independent scientists.

It's time to stop looking at selling out the province and to heck with the consequences, but under the scrutinizing eye of a strong environmental watchdog, develop the province for the betterment of the population and not just a corporations bottom line. Plus it is now time to make corporations be completely responsible for any and all clean up and/or restitution, resulting from damage to the environment, indigenous species, human habitation and quality of life, which has either directly or indirectly caused by them.

People and the planet must be the first consideration if we are to survive and thrive.
Thank you for your time.

=====

Please ensure that more projects are actually reviewed, that First Nations partner in assessments, and that citizens and independent scientists have meaningful input.

Projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets **MUST** be rejected.

Projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent **MUST** be rejected.

=====

Protect environment by rejecting projects that do not meet our climate targets. Ensure collaboration with First Nations in assessments. Allow, consider, citizen and independent scientist input.
No increase in tanker traffic BC waterways.

=====

At this crucial time I really hope that the BC NDP will make sure environmental assessment laws are made very strong and without loopholes through which anyone and particularly big corporations, can worm their way out of complying!

Our laws need to protect long term sustainability of our natural environment, support our climate targets, consult and respect our First Nations ancient wisdoms, and listen to scientists and local people's knowledge.

Monitoring, compliance and enforcement must all be strong and rigorous. It is also important to make sure that every project that might affect climate change is reviewed.

This is much bigger than just BC and while only have jurisdiction in our own province, these laws must be such that they support government and make it clear which projects are unacceptable for the good of our environment and the greater good of the country and the planet.

=====

I urge you to make sure that BC is no longer rubber stamping approval for industries that have little regard for the indigenous peoples, little regard for local communities and the environment. I am encouraged that the NDP government is standing up against projects such as the Trans Mountain Pipeline. Please make sure that projects have a thorough review process which includes input from independent scientists and the citizens of this province. We must also make sure that the indigenous people are not only included in the input but are also asked for their express permission. Projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent AND do not meet BCs climate targets should be rejected.

=====

It is important that all major projects have an independent assessment of their possible impact on Indigenous rights and in particular if they work against provincial and federal GHG emission reduction targets. Decisions should be science/fact based and publicly available.

=====

I think any matters concerning the environment should be voted on by citizens or at the very least there should be public consultation that is actually adhered to. Our coast is too important to let foreign companies dictate it's future.

=====

As a registered B.C. voter, I would like to urge the present government to do all in its power to strengthen environmental protection (including climate targets) and to respect indigenous rights in preference to commercial interests.

=====

Projects with potential to impact wildlife and the environment should be reviewed and rejected unless damage is preventable or fixable. Project proponents or users must ensure the financial aspect of cleanup.

=====

BC Environmental Assessments should include the following:

- 1) Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments.
- 2) Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding. More input from citizens and independent scientists.
- 3) Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments.
- 4) Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria are rejected, including a climate test and Indigenous consent.

=====

BC Environmental Assessments should include the following:

- 1) Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments.
- 2) Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding. More input from citizens and independent scientists.
- 3) Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments.
- 4) Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria are rejected, including a climate test and Indigenous consent.

=====

From Mount Polley to Kinder Morgan -- weak environmental oversight has made our province the Wild West of resource extraction. Industry is calling the shots and we are left to literally clean up the mess. It's devastating our communities, it's destroying our environment, and it's just plain unfair.

I want our new BC government to make things right and pull environmental management out of the hands of industry and put it where it belongs: in the hands of British Columbians.

Please ensure environmental assessment in B.C. engages with First Nations, listens to scientists and citizens, and allows for rejecting projects that don't meet climate targets or receive Indigenous consent.

Rubber stamping hazardous projects with little industry oversight and accountability is how environmental crises like Mount Polley and Shownigan Lake came about. This is our chance to prevent disasters like these from happening again.

=====

The Government of British Columbia represents, and is answerable to all citizens of this province, not just the small, but wealthy subsection of the population that control and benefit most from industries that exploit and deplete our provincial resources; therefore it is imperative that environmental assessment reforms result in a wholistic review process whereby the common good takes priority over profits for the

few, and that all projects considered must take into account the whole life-cycle of the enterprise, from inception to eventual closure and reclamation, and that all the potential environmental, social, health, safety and fiscal risks posed to the citizenry, and the natural ecosystems that we all rely for our existence, are sufficiently guarded against.

=====

I am a 20-year old university student studying environmental sciences, political sciences and indigenous studies. I have learned so much about this province and this country that moves me to tears of grief and disappointment. Our mistakes are right in front of our eyes (eg. Mount Polley, Exxon Valdez, Kinder Morgan, the landslide and clearcut scars that ravage the mountains), and it would be just plain idiotic if we were to not learn from these disasters. I want to see every proposed project that plans to alter the earth extensively reviewed, with input from citizens (most importantly those who LIVE IN THE AREA!) and non-government-affiliated scientists. Not only should all projects REQUIRE Indigenous consent in order to go forward, but there should be collaboration with First Nations that produces informed joint assessments. If we want to show dedicated climate action, then a simple 1+1 evaluation should refuse any projects that surpass our climate targets. Most importantly, I want to see the government of my province treat the Earth first and foremost as a living being, to be respected, rather than a faceless resource base to fill our pockets. We are not above the environment, and it doesn't need our protection, we just simply need to stop destroying it. Let's get back in our lane. There are many many citizens who feel this way, educated or uneducated, rich or poor, city-dwellers or ruralists. So why don't you start actually listening to their concerns about provincial matters? Thank you for hearing from me.

=====

You don't need to be told of the cross roads our planet is at, you have all the data. What you do need, it seems, is confirmation of the support the residents of the Province of British Columbia are giving you to take the hard line against companies and businesses that are a very real threat to our environment. Jobs will be created by turning our sights to clean energy sources, and lives will be saved by doing so.

Use of collaboration with the First Nations to make vital decisions regarding our environment only makes sense

We the citizens of British Columbia put our trust and hope in your government to do the right thing for our fragile ecosystem.

=====

It's critical that all environmental resource industries are held to a strict account with government oversight and regular monitoring plus consequences. The Mount Polly Mine disaster should never have happened. And sensitive ecosystems are held hostage on the east coast of Vancouver Island by big companies. Environmental protection of habitat does not seem to apply when the land is privately owned. Over 1/5th of the East Coast of Vancouver Island including watersheds and ungulate and other wildlife habitats can be logged and flogged thanks to the E and N land grant. Protections and regulations with accountability needs to be in place.

=====

Hearings should hear from environmental experts and the general public that are affected by what is being proposed. That has not happened re.

Pipelines, and SiteC. Many on the NO side were not called upon to testify although they made application to be heard.

If natural gas is exported from Kitimat how do you propose to offset added pollution? What are your plans for a green economy?

Wild fires from increased temperatures demand action. Cooperation with Western U.S. States for a united effort to could make a world of difference to our combined carbon footprints. At this time acting locally is important.

I am a long time member of the NDP.

=====

We all know fish farms, Site C, Shawnigan Lake, Mount Polley, Kinder Morgan - these projects and others and their disastrous, or potentially devastating outcomes are yet another example of 16 years of BC Liberal uncaring and inaction. It is abundantly clear that their only concern was helping the rich get richer and lining their own coffers, not looking out for ordinary British Columbians. It is up to this government to fix the way the decisions are made whether to go ahead with projects like this or not and not because someone knows someone and needs a favour or may be looking for a job one day down the road. There needs to be consultation with First Nations, local communities, input from any British Columbians wishing to participate and actual real, scientific reviews before ANY decisions made. I totally support a complete overhaul of environmental laws.

=====

Strong environmental legislation and effective monitoring is needed. Industry self regulation and monitoring clearly has failed. Government needs to regulate and monitor.

=====

yes it is essential for environmental assessments to always be done and regular reviews and realistic indemnity and bonds provided please

=====

Enough is truly enough. The utter failure to act after the Mount Polley event is stomach-churning. There have been enough failures to protect this province from the dishonest and the rapacious. So-called professional oversight by industry has clearly been a failure. I am quite willing to see taxes raised to cover the cost of regulatory oversight and to listen to the inevitable howls.

In short, it time for oversight and to be rid of secret industry access to government and bureaucracy. The start is the need for proper review and meaningful oversight of every site in the province.

=====

Do you understand that British Columbians live in our beautiful province because we love the nature of it? This has always been so.

We want to ensure that ALL projects are completely third party reviewed and All findings are put on the table for ALL B.C. people to see. All funding for the research should be TOTALLY exposed.

It is ESSENTIAL that First Nations are ABSOLUTELY RESPECTED and LEAD in joint assessments. British Columbians are abhorrent of bullying industrial corporations and government that allows itself to be bullied.

We love our province with all of it's people and nature. We don't want to lose any of it.

=====

My whole career was in Govt resource agencies. I've reviewed and commented on many environmental assessments. Invariably industry sponsored assessments contain a lot of spin to encourage a positive (for them) outcome. This must change. Public resources cannot be treated in a cavalier fashion. Govt must take back control, using expert staff knowledge, independent outside expertise and indigenous and public input. Resource industries cannot be trusted to police themselves. Govt's first responsibility must be the public interest, very broadly defined. The resources belong to us and we, both directly and through our political and staff representatives, must determine their best "use" - which in some cases could mean no extraction.

We need a thorough, honest, inclusive and transparent process, enshrined in law and rigourously enforced.

=====

One aspect of Environmental Assessment is rarely considered: the governing jurisdiction is always the insurer of last resort.

Why not treat Environmental Assessment, in part, as an insurance problem? That is, make sure that the province gets enough benefit, in monetary terms, to exceed the expected liability. Hire an actuary or scientific generalist equivalent, and listen to him.

=====

please revise the current environmental review process for projects like Trans Mountain tripling of the bitumen pipeline, Mount Polley Mine tailing pond with relayed fracking procedures. In overseeing proposed revisions the policy, purposely include protect Indigenous inherent rights as relates to land use and waterways. Simultaneously considering the safety, health and prosperity of all residents in B.C. Impliment standards, higher than any others in Canada and in line with those of other ecosystems found in Finland, Iceland, Sweden and Slovenia. Your acute attention to these en mass life altering policies is imperative at this time and will be the legacy you leave for generations thanks come.

=====

I am deeply concerned that current environmental assessements are not reflecting the total impacts caused on native populations and on the ecology of the territories affected. I urge you to reform the environmental assessment process by collaborating with First Nations to lead environmental assessments,

and having more input by independent scientists and citizens. I fully support the proposal by this Gov't to reject projects that do not have native people's consent.

=====

It's time to fix B.C.'s environmental laws. I am pleased with your bid to to make things right and pull environmental management out of the hands of industry and put it where it belongs in the hands of British Columbians.

We need to reject those projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent and those that would blow B.C.'s climate target.

=====

Please take the watch dogging of industry out of the hands of the industries themselves. We need government environmental review boards that are accountable to the people of BC.
I want to see independent scientists making assessments, not those hired by the companies who want to go ahead with business as usual.
I want to see projects which would put paid to our climate targets vetoed.
I want to see First Nations included in decisions which are on their lands, and not just ignored. When they veto a project, that should be the end of it. Let us respect the dictate of "Seventh Generation"

=====

WE HAVE TO STOP BEING SO SELFISH AND THINK OF FUTURE GENERATIONS.
WE ARE STILL PART OF NATURE AND BY NOT TAKING CARE OF IT WE ARE POISONING OUR FUTURE.
PLEASE MAKE ALL POTENTIAL FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS GO THROUGH A RIGOROUS AND COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.

=====

Environmental assessment must be overseen by scientists, First Nations and the public - and must be well removed from any control by industry itself. Too much damage has already been done.

=====

I've grown increasingly concerned at the apparent lack of good governance regarding environmental policy. Our caribou herds are disappearing, we have yet to clean up major environmental disasters such as Mount Polley, or the pouring of farmed salmon blood and waste into the oceans, plus a a multitude of unsustainable situations. I want to ensure environmental assessment in B.C. engages with First Nations, listens to scientists and citizens, and allows for rejecting projects that don't meet climate targets or receive Indigenous consent.

=====

Weak environmental oversight has caused unimaginable environmental damage across the province. Profit for big business should not be involved in making decisions about environmental impact. We need a major overhaul of the environmental review process. All projects must be thoroughly reviewed by scientist. Projects that would not meet the BC climate targets or support from local communities to be rejected. No more rubber stamps for the companies & corporations. They should not be involved in decision the making.

=====

Please significantly strengthen environmental regulations to:

- .1 prevent disasters like the Mount Polley mine tailings' pond dam collapse, and ensure those responsible are swiftly punished;
 - .2 ensure thorough, independent and unbiased environmental reviews of all major resource extraction projects;
 - .3 protect the province against strong arm tactics being applied by the federal and other provincial governments to get reckless and unpopular projects like the Kinder Morgan Transmountain Pipeline expansion being approved and built.
- =====

B.C. must stop making environmental reviews a mere pretense and a sham to make us citizens think we are being a) listened to and b) protected whilst in fact everything (called "resources") is being handed over to corporate interests. We need actual environmental reviews, actual consultation with communities, including First Nations, actual monitoring of all projects to make sure they are adhering to environmental and safety parameters and actual holding companies responsible (i.e. no bail outs for or having the province cover the costs of) breaches of safety or environmental whoopses.

=====

It is important to me as a mother and grandmother that we steward our environment as well as we possibly can. Our environment is in grave danger. Part of good environmental stewardship are thorough assessments of all environmental impacts. That means enough people to do the assessments, the right people to do it, and science based responses to those assessments. Thank you.

=====

All environmental assessments need to be conducted by an independent "panel" of technical and scientific specialists from a number of Universities across Canada.

If Industry is so sure of their environmental and technical assessments, regarding the safety from environmental impacts and destruction, they must first post a Surety Bond prior to developing any operation. Surety Bonds will cover environmental damages and any costs for remediation and will come immediately from the posted Bond. Any shortfall in costs for remediation will be added to the Company's

account, not the taxpayers.

The Bankruptcy Act will not exonerate executives from punitive damages or stop the seizure of property and assets from all parties and subsidiaries, including Bank assets.

All internal engineers working for the Company lose their say in correcting an environmental problem caused by their Company, as they didn't have the technical/scientific ability/skills to provide oversight in the first place. And like all professional engineers, their liability insurance is accessed, similarly to the Surety Bond.

So that politicians don't influence or bias a decision, the report from the independent panel is the governing document. This assessment document/certification is paid for by the Company wishing to open operations. This will prevent the Company from employing a biased engineering firm to come up with their own self-interest evaluations/assessment. And gives the Company a document/certification which they would have had to pay for, before submitting the project plans to the Provincial Government. Oversight is provided by the Provincial Government's Environmental Department and not by Federal or other Provincial jurisdictions.

Health costs are Provincial responsibilities. Therefore, other Provincial or Federal authorities need not be consulted, unless the Company's operation effects other Province's waterways (i.e. lakes, rivers, estuaries and Oceans) and Indigenous Rights.

=====

Please create environmental assessments that: have real and lasting benefits for a clean and green environment, that lead the way in Canada using the best tools to protect our province, that require above all that Indigenous Peoples rights and their understanding of the land and waters is foremost in decision making, that clean water for all is a number one protected value, that destructive pipelines, mining, forestry practices will be rejected to preserve all life in BC's waters, lands and communities.

=====

I believe it's time to strengthen environmental protection in BC. The review mechanism should be more stringent and enforceable. Understandably, there are proposed projects and current operations, which in a narrow scope, seem positive, but are not in our overall best interest. Govt. must be able to assess existing and proposed operations with an over arching long term view in recognizing the value of BC's nature and protect it from detriment.

=====

I think environmental assessments need to be done and should be done by independent scientists and investigators, rather than those hired or paid for by the developer/proponent of the project. At the same time, the assessment must take into account the needs and desires of the Indigenous nation affected, and their consent must be obtained before anything else.

If B.C. is to make an appreciable difference toward the ill effects of climate change, we must turn away from fossil fuels.

=====

1. Polluters should pay.

Please make sure that we don't have another Mount Polley, and that, if similar damage to the environment occurs through unsafe business practices, it's the company that pays, not tax payers.

2. We need stronger environmental laws for industry to follow, and the laws actually need to be enforced.

3. No more trade agreements that include ISDS where international trade tribunals can override our national, provincial and municipal laws, and also discourage any further strengthening of our environmental, labour and other laws.

4. Collaboration and real consultation with First Nations needs to be part of the approval process of any project. This should not be compromised due to bribery.

5. Approval of any projects needs to be science based.

6. Impact of any project on greenhouse gas emissions/our climate targets needs to be considered.

=====

You are on the right track!

The resources belong to the people.

Corporations need to clean up their spills and all other negative impacts that require our dollars to rectify. Also they need to be held accountable for the hidden costs that destroy environments and the negative impacts on social values.

=====

You are on the right track!

The resources belong to the people.

Corporations need to clean up their spills and all other negative impacts that require our dollars to rectify. Also they need to be held accountable for the hidden costs that destroy environments and the negative impacts on social values.

=====

Please begin a new with the environmental assessment process. Start with consulting people directly affected in the region, public and first nations, and make the public aware that these consultations take place. Second consult with scientists and existing environmental groups. Third, seek input from those in industry who know the impacts of projects and how to do them well, for example if a wind project is proposed, seek input from the Clean Energy assoc. of BC. Finally, as you move through this process, make it transparent and generational, not just for your terms of the near future. We have to start protecting 50% of this planet if we want any diversity to survive. Start soon in BC and work toward this goal pls.

=====

From Mount Polley to Kinder Morgan -- weak environmental oversight has made our province the Wild West of resource extraction. Industry is calling the shots and we are left to literally clean up the mess. It's devastating our communities, it's destroying our environment, and it is unjust.

I want the B.C government wants to pull environmental management out of the hands of industry and put it where it belongs: in the hands of British Columbians.

Environmental assessment in B.C. Needs to engage with First Nations, listen to scientists and citizens, and allow for rejecting projects that don't meet climate targets or receive Indigenous consent.

=====

Environmental assessment of resource extraction and transportation projects should foreground the following principles:

- consistency of the project with effective climate action, and the transitioning towards a lower-carbon economy
- rights of Indigenous peoples to meaningful participation in decisions affecting their territories
- evidence and input from affected communities and publics, and independent scientific experts
- an assessment of the amount of public subsidies, and of positive and negative externalities, entailed by the project
- internalization of costs (e.g. land remediation) that are too often borne by communities and taxpayers; companies should be required to cover such costs
- the relative contribution of the project to permanent jobs within BC
- a level playing field for advocacy for or against the project, e.g. spending limits for promotion and advertising (a negative example is the NEB allowing Kinder Morgan to collect an additional \$132 million from its customers, to seedfund its proposal for TMX)
- a reasonably low threshold for the scale of projects requiring review

=====

We need to have proper reviews of environmental impacts that could happen before any projects are licensed

These should be done by an apolitical scientific organization

=====

From Mount Polley to Kinder Morgan -- weak environmental oversight has made our province the Wild West of resource extraction. Industry is calling the shots and we are left to literally clean up the mess. It's devastating our communities, it's destroying our environment, and it's just plain unfair.

This is our chance to ensure environmental assessment in B.C. engages with First Nations, listens to scientists and citizens, and allows for rejecting projects that don't meet climate targets or receive Indigenous consent.

Rubber stamping hazardous projects with little industry oversight and accountability is how environmental crises like Mount Polley and Shawnigan Lake came about.

I want stronger UNBIASED environmental assessments.

=====

I am hopeful that the overhaul of B.C.'s Environmental Assessment process will remove the influence of industry and those in conflict of interest from the process. Truly put the environment first in this process, and ensure that any project does not jeopardize our local ecosystems' integrity, our water's safety, nor the larger goals of achieving BC's and Canada's climate targets. Then actually apply the process to all projects, not just those over a certain size or scope. Please!

=====

The Mt. Polley debacle was a significant event for me and for the province: weak oversight and management, lack of responsibility for clean-up and remediation, and an ownership in bed with the government. In short, all the things I want my current government to address. For me, this is key to what a responsible government should do. Please ensure: that we have an arms-length relationship with industry (now and in future), that we have an environmental assessment and planning process which involves credible and independent experts, mandated oversight of industrial projects, and an absolute requirement that industry is responsible for clean-up AND remediation - with funds set aside to do so. And if industry can't/won't live with these conditions in order to proceed, then too damn bad!!

=====

I understand the history of industrial power and control over economic development, and the relative disregard for the integrity of the environment. However the results of that are obviously something we can no longer afford, and it is only sensible to require polluters to pay. Continuing to regard environmental degradation as an externality is a habit that must be stopped, otherwise profits will be made on the backs of taxpayers. Industry needs a new ethic that requires it to clean up its mess, or to simply not make one in the first place. Sustainable practices are the key!

=====

Engagement with First Nations should be a vital component of BC's new environmental review process, and projects that don't receive Indigenous consent should be rejected. Projects that don't meet climate targets should also be rejected. Scientific data and research should be thorough and acted upon, and input from British Columbians should be taken into account in a realistic way.

=====

I would like to see our environmental protection and respect for indigenous and future generations' rights take precedence this year.

Please ensure that:

more projects are actually reviewed before they are approved;

we collaborate with First Nations for joint assessments;

we have more input from BC residents and independent scientists;

BC's climate targets are met;

We reject projects that fail to receive indigenous consent.

=====

Canada is very strict with health care professionals and people from other countries have to retake examinations to prove that they are worthy to work in Canada. This same intense scrutiny and even more needs to be applied to industry and especially any company that will damage Canada's precious environment in the effort of extracting the natural resources. They must return the environment on a regular basis to its previous condition and not leave it devastated. This way the water and nature will be preserved in their pure form and nature will be assisted in healing itself. As it is now I see a raping of the earth with no mending happening by the greedy materialistic companies that are allowed to leave the land like a bomb hit it with no rehabilitation. What kind of laws are these!!!!

=====

We applaud the decision of the BC government to overall the way that environmental assessments have been done in our province. We understand your government is proposing a wide variety of changes including reviewing more projects, involving indigenous groups in the assessments where it is appropriate, asking for broad range of input, rejecting any project which would adversely affect our Climate targets and rejecting projects in the territory of indigenous peoples that don't get their consent and we support all of these.

=====

Our environmental assessment and permitting process needs improvement. I would like to see independent assessments and monitoring. All terms and conditions to include the "precautionary principle" . All mining permits to be issued or co-signed by the local zoning authorities. (not solely at provincial or federal discretion)

=====

We need strong environmental laws and the ability to see they are enforced. Our air, water and earth are vital to us and our future generations and must be protected from short sighted greed. We need to have a long view to make sure that we protect that which cannot be replaced. Stand firm, have vision and know that we need our planet intact to survive. Environmental Assessment should include holding those who gain from our resources to be responsible for the results of there actions, immediate and in the long term. We are at the crisis point and need you to stand tall and firm.

=====

We strongly support more rigorous environmental reviews of any activities that have the potential to impact the natural systems that sustain life on earth in BC. That includes :

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

The Restoration, Preservation and Protection of our Indigenous Environment, Culture and Knowledge must be our goal. Let's fix B.C.'s irresponsible environmental laws for the benefit of all.

=====

We need laws and provincial agencies to assess possible ecological damage from pending businesses and existing businesses. Businesses need to be held financially accountable for any ecological damage they cause. There is only one planet earth and the planet can't sustain much more damage.

=====

I'm am in FULL support of our Provincial Government of BC which is working towards optimizing the way we conduct environmental laws and reviews. The way the Federal Government has handled the Kinder/Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline issue is a prime example of the Federal Governments disregard for the health and safety of the people and environment of BC, Alberta and country. It clearly displays how the Federal Government does Not support or ensure Indigenous consent and collaboration prior to approving projects, and it clearly shows that our Federal Government does not consider or even care about meeting provincial and federal climate targets .

I am appalled at our Federal Governments lack of care for the people and environment of this country.

I demand

- 1) Projects are reviewed scientifically where all evidence is presented and cross examined by experts who are NOT employed or affiliated or stand to gain from industrial go ahead.
- 2) Collaboration with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- 3) More input from citizens and independent scientists
- 4) Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- 5) Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent.

=====

Please ensure that all projects are reviewed and that scientists w/no ties to industry, i.e. reputable, are consulted and their knowledge taken into strong account.

=====

We need more oversight in environmental proposals that will impact our communities. The public needs to be invited into and engaged in this process. We need to protect our community from environmental disasters!

=====

We need to change our environment policy. We new projects starts there needs to be more power given back to the people who are at risk of effected by a project.

=====

It is long past time to change BC's environmental laws and regulations, and to begin enforcing them.

Indigenous groups need to be a major partner in the process and to agree to proposed changes.

ALL projects with potential impact on the environment need to be reviewed for compliance and permits denied for any that are not in full compliance.

=====

I'm for stronger environmental assessment.

=====

British Columbia's future depends on strong environmental protection for all communities in our province. We must consider both short term and long term impacts of projects, as well as upstream and downstream pollution and risks. All British Columbians deserve clean air, water and soil. Our environmental assessments must prioritize climate and environmental science, community well-being, and long-term thinking that respects First Nations rights and the rights of future generations to live and thrive.

=====

I am so grateful that we now have a government committed to cleaning up the mess left by your predecessors

Please continue to do everything you can to preserve our province for future generations.

I would not be happy if all that our children inherited was holes in the ground and sludge to swim in.

It is past time for all of us to realize that we only have one Earth and we have to change the way we are looking after it.

Thank you for the changes you are implementing

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed

Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments

More input from citizens and independent scientists

Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I would like to see more consultation with the Indigenous of British Columbia. I believe their traditional ecological knowledge is our most powerful tool we can use to manage and protect the environment of our beautiful province.

=====

I know that there are often conflicting goals of protecting the environment and economic development. Recognizing the need for progress, it is imperative that environmental factors not be forgotten. Environmental impact must be mitigated to the extent practical and the welfare of future generations kept paramount.

=====

Large deposits should be demanded by any companies doing environmentally risky business in or through BC and nearby offshore, to cover costs of disaster cleanup.
Thank you for the changes being made, I'm proud of what the NDP has been doing to protect BC.

=====

I am surprised we are still able to comment and ask 'why not'? keep our ENVIROMENT safe from human activity. Lets keep mining activity down and keep pollution controlled by rejecting projects that cause harm. Listen to the FIRST NATIONS AND RESPECT A PEOPLE THAT LIVED OFF THE LAND before europeans came along and started to 'own' everything and leave it a polluted ness and damaged the environment.

=====

My life has been interesting, I grew up in Sparwood British Columbia, , land of coal. When I left in 1969, the underground mines were being less utilized, and strip mining was just starting to be the destruction of choice.. Now close to 50 years later, some mountains are gone and the beautiful Elk River is poisoned with selenium, which is creating huge problems for fish in Canadian and adjacent American waters. Along the way, countless hectares of forest are no more, putting species and ecosystems at risk. It is a monumental disaster.

In 2004, after 35 years in Ontario, I moved to mid-Vancouver Island.
I wasn't here too long before the Raven Coal Mine Proposal was put forth. That was not a viable project in any way, shape or form from the get-go, and big waste of valuable time in the communities that would have been affected. It shouldn't even have qualified for consideration.

And then, came along Fish Lake, the Mount Polley Disaster, the ravaging of Northern BC with damming and fracking, Site C, the siting of fish farms on our wild salmon route....just to name a few.

I think there are some good case studies on "what not to do". Look at these cases for guidance on what needs to be done differently.

Continuing current practices in environmental matters is an existential threat.

I would like to see:

1. Using the pre-cautionary principle in all cases.
2. Put teeth into reclamation commitments after projects are completed. (bonds or the like)
3. Give weight to climate impacts, both positive and negative.
4. Always collaborate with, and involve First Nations.
5. Give impacted communities more voice.
6. Look at natural resources in a different light, what is their value if they are left in place ie Social, recreational. cultural, look at the Town of Gibsons for insight into ecosystem services.

We need a new paradigm in B.C. It will take lots of vision and courage.

Thanks for the opportunity to input.

=====

Please support changes that would see stricter and more stringent environmental review processes. These need to be more independent and more scientifically and socially responsible. The first nations concerns must be met.

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes. Early engagement, meaningful public participation and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

However, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-

reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence

- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

There should be no site preparation allowed for any reason in advance of approval of the project on all terms as has happened at the Kinder Morgan site - no technicalities allowed.

=====

Please support changes that would see stricter and more stringent environmental review processes. These need to be more independent and more scientifically and socially responsible. The first nations concerns must be met.

=====

Please support changes that would see stricter and more stringent environmental review processes. These need to be more independent and more scientifically and socially responsible. The first nations concerns must be met.

=====

For years B.C. rubber-stamped pipelines, mines, fracking and toxic waste sites with little regard for local communities. A major overhaul to the way we conduct environmental reviews is needed.

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

To our elected representatives:

As you begin the essential process of reforming BC's gutted environmental "management" legislation, we ask that you prioritize the following requirements:

- *Exclusion of business/industry influence on decision making
- *Inclusion of scientific analysis from non-industry (by employment or contract) related scientists
- *Inclusion of representatives of all communities (First Nations and other) whose status quo will be impacted by proposed project development
- *Final decisions on project acceptance to be based on consensus of environmental assessment team (as above) that project impact will not have net negative impacts on the environmental, ecologic, social and cultural quality of communities and on the economic and lifestyle opportunities they support

You have an opportunity to make BC a leader in transitioning from an unsustainable, absurd economic model based on rapid resource extraction to an intelligent, sustainable model based on resource management within the carrying capacity of the environment.

=====

I submit these comments with urgency as our Environmental Assessments have been do eroded during the previous administration they are of little use.

- all projects must be seriously reviewed;
 - accept and seriously take action on citizen concerns;
 - independent scientific evidence must be considered not just scientists contracted by government who could be bias;
 - reject all projects that do not comply or exceed provincial & federal climate targets;
 - First Nations should also be included in assessment process and their rights seriously considered;
 - and the right of all people to live in a clean & toxic free environment was be put forth first & foremost.
 - other Indigenous species & their habitat must not be harmed in any way.
- =====

I want to see consultation with the people who live in the areas affected by poor and short sighted choices in environmental protection. Not only should these residents be heard but the entire province have a say in what is going on affecting all our health and the health of our land and peoples.

=====

We need to change our perspective. It is not new, in fact I think the Aboriginal societies arrived at the point of view, and lived by it for centuries. Having now overtaken the resources and carrying capability of our planet by more than twice, we need to return to what we should see as the Original Thinking:

We are today just as dependent on the earth's bounty (and limits) as our Stone Age ancestors were. That is to say we depend on having breathable air (uncontaminated, and in proper proportions of O to CO2), clean, fresh drinking water, fertile arable soils free of toxic chemicals, and adequate, undisturbed wildlife habitats.

We need to arrive at proper sustainable use from a different point of view. Rather than considering the most profitable utilization in monetary terms, we need to consider the broader picture of maintaining overall ecological health. For example, we now know that in many cases world wide over- clearcutting large areas of forests has had negative results. In the southern hemisphere the soils that were supposed to provide agriculture once the trees were gone, failed to be productive. In other cases erosion washed out soils, and contaminated streams, killing fish. Likewise, streams - once deprived of forest cover dried up.

In Canada we treat our fresh water in an incredibly cavalier way! Let's take one example: "Fracking" inserts toxic chemicals into the ground. Do we check whether in the long term underground water reserves might be contaminated? We need to do that, and if any danger of contamination exists, the fracking must not go ahead. That is why environmental assessment should precede economic undertakings, and over-ride in decision making.

Each Canadian region should properly have ecological standards geared to its particular ecology. In a country with such diverse geography one size fits all cannot be the best approach. The principles need to be the same for all, but not the details.

There are some general considerations that must be universal: As suggested above, protecting our fresh water bodies is urgent, and must have no exceptions! This approach would absolutely eliminate the possibility of using natural lakes (Eg. Fish lake proposal by Taseko mines) for waste disposal of any sort.

Standards of care need to be critically strengthened, to eliminate situations such as the Polley mine disaster where the negligent company, Imperial Metals, got away with a wrist slap, and is continuing mining, while the toxins are flowing into our most pristine large lake, Quesnel lake. Not only that, but this company also got permission to mine in 2 more areas in BC! This sort of negligence must make any company ineligible to do any further mining in BC/Canada.

The emphasis needs to shift from purely economic considerations to much broader considerations of maintaining a healthy ecology. If we take forestry as one example, we now know that there is a very close relationship between forests, fish and wildlife. The old growth depends on the fertilization from decaying salmon brought and left there by wolves and bears. The entire economic and ecological costs and benefits have never been factored into BC's industrial activities!

If our massive clear cut logging practices are the only economic way to harvest, then we need to look deeper. It is possible that lumber is underpriced, the over-cutting masking its real value. In countries where forests have been depleted, homes are built from concrete blocks, and other materials, with wood being used for finishes such as paneling, and flooring. This allows value added uses to develop, such as furniture -- note Denmark, and Sweden.

Conclusion: The value of forests is not just commercial. They are major climate regulators, wildlife habitats, preventing streams from drying out, etc. In the long term these values are more important to Canada's economic and social sustainability.

We need to consider all potential development in a similarly broad perspective. BC is rich in both forest and mineral resources. To date we have tended to overlook the critical importance of the "undeveloped" landscapes from a "resource value" perspective. They may be the most important and valuable resource going! The wild landscapes may be what in the long term sustains all life on earth! They may be saving us from extinction!

=====

I strongly support a major overhaul to the environmental review process in BC.

All projects with a significant environmental impact should be reviewed.

Assessments should be conducted in collaboration with First Nations; projects that fail to secure indigenous consent should be rejected.

Assessments should allow input from concerned citizens and independent scientists.

Projects that would hamper BC efforts to meet climate targets should be rejected.

Premier John Horgan's decision to proceed with Site C shook my faith in the NDP government's commitment to act on climate change. Enacting strong legislation to govern environmental reviews would be a step towards regaining trust.

=====

This idea that BC is the 'Wild West' of industry regulating has got to STOP! Corporate profits and bottom lines have been ruling the province long enough at the expense of the environment and the average citizen. Meanwhile we are a joke as far as the rest of the civilized world goes because we let this kind of archaic system continue unabated! This isn't Indonesia or Ghana...this is British Columbia and we are supposedly this 'world class' Province...act like it! Regulate these industries. Have independent bodies supervising, and restricting damage to the environment in Oil exploration and transport, fracking, mining and logging.

=====

I support strong environmental assessment and regulation. Don't go with what's easy. Go with what is safe and correct and doesn't do lasting damage. Just say no to bad projects and enact stiff penalties for polluters and violators. Thank you.

=====

I would like to see that any environmental management is taken away from industry and beING managed by the government of BC in consultation with first nations, scientists and citizens of BC. Industry is not looking out for the environment and is only interested in profits. So let's take over and do proper environmental assessments before granting any permits. Please save BC for future generations. We owe it to them.

=====

As a new father of two young boys I believe we need to have strong environmental protection to avoid the disastrous consequences of climate change. It seems like we are already passed the point of no return and I fear for the future of this planet and those that inhabit it. When projects are proposed that alter the natural environment and extract natural resources we should take the proper measures to determine whether the project is safe and viable for future generations. British Columbia should reject any projects that will not help us meet our climate targets. I also believe we should collaborate with First Nations to lead joint assessments of projects, as well as having input from citizens and independent scientists. Thank you.

=====

I want environmental laws based on scientific understanding of what will protect our planet. I feel that time is running out and we should do all we can to stop global warming in particular.

=====

Please put British Columbia's citizens and natural resources as a priority over industry's demands and spoils. Please tighten environmental assessments and standards. Please put public stewardship of our natural environment as a priority.

=====

I would like to see stronger environmental impact assessments for all resource extraction, transportation and energy. This should include how the project meets or exceeds Canada's future carbon and methane targets, impacts to wildlife, ecosystems and waterways, and indigenous consent not just consultation. The project shareholders should provide a large damage deposit that would cover the environmental damage in a "worst case scenario".

With the climate and environmental situation we have created on this planet the time for cutting old growth forest, damming rivers, extracting and piping dilbit is over and all new projects should meet the vision for 50 years from now. Species extinction, extreme weather and sea level rise is happening every minute of every day.

=====

I strongly hope the government of BC enacts tougher standards for environmental assessments of resource projects. We need to enter into a new era that provides the strongest protections for our people, our wildlife and our environment and set up a process that demands thorough review of how these entities will be affected in the long term by resource extraction. To be credible, the assessment must take into consideration the social external costs associated with the project (which are difficult to measure - I understand). The assessment should also consider the inter generational impacts (costs) and the rights of First Nations. What an opportunity we have to make progress towards better protecting our natural environment, which needs all the protection it can get as climate change impacts continue to affect living ecosystems.

=====

The more these companies have license to do what they want when they want to, the less we the people have a voice and a choice. Performing natural resource projects without environmental review and Indigenous consent is like performing a surgery without thought to how it will affect a patient down the line and without their consent. Except this hurts and wipes out whole communities.

=====

Please to continue your excellent work to renew BCs environmental oversight process.

=====

Please would the provincial government of BC fix our laws to allow proper environmental assessment of projects including an actual review of more projects.

This process should include a collaborative relationship with First Nations to lead joint assessments. In addition to input from citizens and independent scientists.

Any project that would cause BC to betray its commitment on climate targets or Indigenous consent should be rejected.

I look forward to a new BC government that will fix our clearly broken process for safeguarding our environment and homes against the toxic projects being proposed and in posed.

Thank you in advance for your help in this extremely important matter.

=====

I wish for environmental reviews prior
to all projects,
and I wish that the government accepts
the environmental finding.

I wish that the NDP had not ignored the
environmental findings, in the case of site C development, had instead honoured them and their
agreement with the BC Greens

=====

please please ensure that all environmental assessments are done properly before any projects that destroy
our beautiful province any further are given the go ahead.

Listen to scientists

Listen to our Indigenous People

Listen to us ordinary citizens.

Frackin and toxic waste has done enough damage already.

=====

Please keep industry away from self regulation, make sure we protect our lands with proper government
oversight and true science based principles. We only have one earth please ensure industry can take care
of it properly.

=====

The unconventional fossil fuels such as dilbit and frack USURP 7.8% out of BC's otherwise strong GDP
(Stats Can). All the jobs, investments and tech is in clean energy today. We need to join the 21st century
and stop threatening our culture, our economy and our coast for more pillage and poison profiteers.

Another issue is the self regulated blanket spraying our "timber interests" with Roundup. Our forests are a
sick chemical soaked mono-culture tinderboxes. This practice needs to cease.

Third is the issue of contagious virus laden, antibiotic resistant bacteria spreading, pesticide laced GMO-
stuffed pestilence called fish farms that are wiping out our wild stocks and killing our coast, This ecocide
needs to be removed from our waters.

Our laws need to reflect actual protections of our most precious resource in this province, which is the
lands, air and water we all depend on.

"Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive
commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion
of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes. Early engagement, meaningful public participation

and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

However, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

=====

I would like to express my opinion about changes to the environmental laws we currently have. I would like new laws to support reconciliation with Indigenous peoples, to regain public confidence and to enhance sustainability.

These laws must:

Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments

Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding

Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments

Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected

- =====
- *We need a clear plan on how we are going to meet BC's climate reduction targets AND a costing of such. People have to know this and must be convinced that these costs are going to be less than say, the 1.1 billion BC spent last year on flooding and fire fighting, not to mention the tourism and logging loss.
 - *Create and Enforce more equitable laws for citizens, and not just the companies extracting resources.
 - *Ensure the PR review report does not get shelved but gets enacted.
 - * Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
 - Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent. Be clear that indigenous consent or the lack there of will have costs.

=====

I would like to see oil and gas, mining and other natural resource projects going through a detailed environmental impact assessment review with First Nation's collaboration and independent scientist's

inputs. We will need to reject projects that will not meet the climate targets and violate First Nation's rights. Thank you!

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive commitments to uphold TRC recommendations. Early engagement, meaningful public participation and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

However, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's (or Canada's) ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise

In particular, people who live in small communities who are concerned about major project proposals that would devastate their health, are forced to volunteer their time to become adequately informed, and be part of the "consultation" process, including BCEA working groups. YET these people (who would be MAJORLY IMPACTED by the proposed project, are the only ones who are NOT being paid for this work. EVERY OTHER PERSON IS IN A PAID POSITION, whether it is for the BC GOVT or for the proponent. The stress and hardship this puts on small communities, worried about the impact a project will have on their future, struggling to maintain their present job workload, parenting, and other chores and then on TOP of that having to deal with finding time to become informed and be part of the "process", meetings, open houses, etc., is an unbearably unjust system. Either paid positions need to be made available for small communities to bear this workload, and/or paid independent consultants need to be made available to bear this workload for them.

- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of local community knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence, all evidence must be made public
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and also lifecycle effects of the project.
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and consent from local communities. These projects should not even be voted on by the ministers - they should not even make it that far. The BCEAO needs to be able to reject projects and not fear for their jobs by whichever government is running the province.

Data from other similar projects that are presently running around the world must be collected and looked at - what impacts did those projects have on local communities, human health, and climate change - and so it would be easy to correlate that similar impacts would be felt here in BC. There is a shocking lack of data being gathered and presented even though impacts from these projects are already known in other areas.

Human health needs to be top priority. The human right for clean air and clean water needs to be recognized, implemented, and respected.

The BC government needs to act as more than a facilitator. It needs to take control. If money is the issue, than bill the proponent for the time the government puts into studying the project. . But the proponent should NOT be guiding the timeline process, the evidence gathering process, the public consultations, any of it. Which at present it is, the fox guarding the henhouse. There should be no communication between the proponent and companies like Stantec, the BC government and local communities should be hiring

Stantec and informing them on what info is needed. Stantec should be working for the public good, not the proponents biased factfinding mission which in reality skews the evidence before its even seen publicly. There should be no communication between the proponent and any stakeholders without independent lawyers representing the local communities present. There should be no secret meetings between the proponent and local government representatives or federal entities that have interests in the whether the project goes through or not, especially if those "stakeholders" are also part of the consultation process, submitting evidence, or using "proprietary evidence" as part of the data collection. No "proprietary evidence" should be used unless released publicly to be reviewed by other scientists. Communities that need more time to review the material, or have an independent team review the material for them, should be able to ask for more time. The timelines set forth in the review process are tight, yet the proponent can halt for more time when needed. Stakeholders that will be impacted by the project should be able to do the same. The working group process should NOT be secret from the public. True answers to the questions from the working group should be expected from the proponent, not cut and paste "we thank you for your comment". Or the project review should not go forward. Media tactics and funding to local communities in attempts to sway public view should be disallowed by proposed projects unless similar means and financial ways to do the same are made available by the impacted communities. Sending out biased messages so the the public is misinformed is hardly "meaningful consultation". Spouting the same at open houses is hardly meaningful consultation. Leaving communities off of maps, disregarding them completely, pretending that they aren't there and that they will not be impacted, is not "meaningful consultation". The present environmental assessment process is such a dog and pony show - so skewed and biased - everything about the process is geared to pushing a project through. No wonder many people wash their hands of it. But if its your community and you are forced to do it to protect your home, you need to be adequately represented, and the present process does not do that. The BC government is NOT adequately representing the BC citizens involved.

=====

Please do not let corporate lobbying cause you to deviate from the goal of good governance.

Proper fact based Environmental Science and the recognition of Indigenous Rights and human rights in general should be the sole determining factors as to whether any resources are extracted or big projects are built.

The only valid purpose of any government is to work cooperatively for the benefit of people.

Allowing corporations to influence decision making serves only to enrich the few at the suffering of the many.

=====

I would like to see public consultation when any project has an environmental impact in our province. We cannot continue to push through projects, like pipe lines, that have a major impact on our environment without doing the work needed for a proper assessment.
Thank you for listening to me .

=====

There needs to be stronger environmental protections and support to enforce and monitor private sector projects. The fines are too low and the damage too high of a risk.

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am ery pleased to see positive commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes.

However, BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in the environmental assessment process.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence

=====

My worry is tax payers are subsidizing these polluters ,and then on the hook to clean up the mess without any of the benefits of being an investor.

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes. Early engagement, meaningful public participation and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

However, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

All companies should have to clean up their own messes. Not to be able to declare bankruptcy and leave it to the taxpayers, even if they were best friend with crusty Clark.

=====

My suggestions:

- ~ensure that evidence and oversight of assessments are done in conjunction with the proponent
- ~ meaningful public participation
- ~address cumulative effects within a region

=====

Its time that a strong stand is made in the interests of our beautiful and unique province. BC comes first - not the insatiable needs of the Albertans for more oil revenue, or of the Feds for more tax dollars. All pipe-line and other oil projects should be very closely reviewed, with BC's needs at the top of the list. All indigenous and other local interests must be consulted, not cynically rubber-stamped. No 'Trumping' - listen to the (independent) scientists! We need a very strong watch dog to oversee and enforce regulations; private industry cannot be trusted to do anything right without being forced to!

=====

As a NDP voter - I have serious concerns with BC's proposed changes to environmental laws. I think the proposed approach is lacking on certain key issues related to enhancing public confidence, advancing reconciliation with First Nations and protecting the environment with new assessment legislation.

I urge your NDP/Green government to address these gaps, through the following measures:

- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments
- Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding
- Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
- Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected.

=====

From the Mount Polley mine disaster to Kinder Morgan's illegal anti-spawning fences, weak environmental oversight has made B.C. the Wild West of resource extraction. It's time to update our laws.

For years B.C. rubber-stamped pipelines, mines, fracking and toxic waste sites with little regard for local communities. But things are shifting. Our new government is proposing a major overhaul to the way we conduct environmental reviews. Big changes on the table include:

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments

More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I want the new British Columbia environmental assessment to include following:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed!
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments!
- More input from citizens and independent scientists!
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets!
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent!

=====

Frankly, I have neither the time nor the energy to read up on CURRENT environmental regulations (whether they be federal or provincial) and/or proposed NEW regulations; I'm too busy attending anti-pipeline events...and serving my 150 hours of Community Service (as a result of being arrested on Burnaby Mountain on March 17, for violating the court-ordered injunction that was granted to Kinder Morgan). That said, I do know that the current regulations are in dire need of amending, updating and loophole-closing. I'll leave it to you guys to figure out the details...and how to achieve real, meaningful, common sense, effective, enforceable (and, when necessary, AGGRESSIVELY ENFORCED)) environmental protection laws.

=====

It is time to rethink our priorities with regard to pipelines and the environment. Too many decisions are being made that do not have the voice of the people behind them. Our water is precious. Our wildlife is precious. When the planet has become so compromised every single decision that is made must be made carefully. I ask decision makers to respect and heed the words of indigenous people and create more relevant environmental assessment laws for our time.

=====

It's time to fix B.C.'s environmental laws

From the Mount Polley mine disaster to Kinder Morgan's illegal anti-spawning fences, weak environmental oversight has made B.C. the Wild West of resource extraction. It's time to update our laws.

For years B.C. rubber-stamped pipelines, mines, fracking and toxic waste sites with little regard for local communities. But things are shifting. Our new government is proposing a major overhaul to the way we conduct environmental reviews. Big changes on the table include:

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

PLEASE:

- Ensure more projects are actually reviewed
 - Collaborate with First Nations to lead joint assessments
 - More input from citizens and independent scientists
 - Reject projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
 - Reject of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent
- =====

Please review and regulate all past and current corporate private projects, environmental disasters and ensure heavy penalties are applied. Collaboration and input from First Nations is a must.

=====

Projects with the potential to impact the environment and/or climate affect all British Columbians and should only proceed with the consent of British Columbians. It is not prudent to create a distinction between different "types" of citizens e.g. indigenous vs nonindigenous. All British Columbians should be seen equally.

Benchmarks for citizen consent must be established by law; and those benchmarks must be met before any particular project proceeds.

Benchmarks for environmental safety must be established by law; and those benchmarks must be met before any particular project proceeds, irrespective of citizen consent.

Benchmarks for control of climate change must be established by law; and the effect of a particular project on climate control performance must be considered prior to approval of a project, irrespective of consent.

Industry is important to our economy but undue influence of industry on laws, policies and permits must be eliminated. The joint force of industry interests must never exceed the force of citizen interests.

Laws need to be enacted to eliminate conflicts of interest, financial and otherwise, among decision makers. Industry ties past or present should eliminate a candidate from decision making.

=====

The precautionary principle must be the prime directive.

Elimination of sources of sewage dumping into the waterways a provision of secure, long-term funding to organizations that conduct contaminants research and monitoring as DFO no longer has a department that focuses on contaminants research and monitoring. Therefore, funding is needed to support independent organizations that are doing this work to preserve a ecosystem.

As a person who loves the exquisite coastline of “Beautiful British Columbia”, I am genuinely concerned about the impacts open net pen farms are having on our ecosystem. Professional reliance on environmental monitoring has created havoc Mount Polley mine disaster, virus ridden blood water in the marine environment, bitumen that cannot be cleaned up must be monitored by independent body.

British Columbia will be left with a struggling ecosystem that cannot support a variety of industries including the many branches of tourism, commercial and sport fishing, marine sales and repair shops, etc. This will be devastating to small coastal communities that are already struggling and the whole province .

=====

In the new assessment laws we need several things:

1. ALL projects must be reviewed.
2. Collaboration with First Nations or else the project does not go forward.
3. Input from Citizens and Independent scientists.
4. The environment has legal standing i.e. that the effects on the long term impacts are included in the equation.
5. Outright rejection of projects that would not be consistent with BC's climate targets.
6. That these be laws, not guidelines that are followed IF convenient.

=====

I want to see proper environmental assessments conducted and reported by independent scientists, not by industry paid consultants or lobbyists. I want the recommendations of the scientists reports to trump any developments. The environment and climate change are far more important than any quick buck in the pocket for any self interested corporation. Projects that fail to meet climate change targets or species or habitat protection need to be rejected. If indigenous rights are not respected, permits should be denied. Government needs to hire more scientists and to put laws in place that will give teeth to enforcement. The reports and recommendations of these employees must be respected and followed. These people cannot be turned into rubber stampers of permits for companies pursuing an industry driven economy. Laws need to be enacted to protect the independence of the scientific reporters, to protect their jobs and the right to speak out. Perhaps such rules and the primacy of environmental health need to be placed as articles of a provincial constitution, where legislators could not change them at whim (ie change would require a 75% majority vote).

=====

We need to ensure projects are actually reviewed and not simply a rubber-stamp on a Federal approval. The NEB has been deeply corrupted by the Harper Conservatives and, unfortunately, the Trudeau Liberals have simply continued the same policies.

We need a proper science-based approval process. We also MUST consider the environmental consequences of approvals, especially to BC, as I am sure that our Federal politicians feels more beholden to the resource industry than to the voters of BC. This includes both BC and Federally-committed-to

climate targets.

In addition, we must secure indigenous consent for these projects. As a Canadian, I feel that our history of ignoring First Nations consent is awful and we need to fix this.

Best wishes on your efforts.

- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I am writing to share my thoughts on environmental assessment in British Columbia.

My major concern is that of Indigenous Rights and Title. I firmly support a government that rejects projects if they do not receive consent by local First Nations. In that vein, I would also support environmental assessment that collaborated more with First Nations people in a joint review process.

It is time for BC, and Canada, to live up to its commitments on Reconciliation.

As a British Columbian concerned about climate change, I would also like to see more projects trigger a review, and be rejected if they put us over our current climate targets.

It is also time for us to meaningfully tackle our climate change commitments. Part of this should be the involvement of independent scientists and public consultation.

=====

I support all efforts that ensure that all activity from resource extraction firms be subjected to independent scientific reviews. We can not afford to pump more and more CO2 into the air. Just look at the wildfires burning around the world and look at the temperatures everywhere with California hitting 47 degrees today!

Please do not allow it that greed will destroy our only planet.

=====

To be succinct, I would like the whole process to address the following:

- independent evidence and independent oversight of assessments
- rigorous peer review of science and technical information
- Indigenous knowledge included
- public hearings (not led by the proponent) adequately funded
- overarching climate test
- look at broad cumulative effects
- Indigenous consent, adhere to UNDRIP

- effect of resource camps on women and girls
- transparent and accountable to the public
- well monitored to ensure compliance – adequate staffing and funding; meaningful fines for non-compliance eg not a \$900 slap on the wrist for laying down anti-spawning mats over our precious salmon spawning streams while protesters who are standing up for our air, land and water get slapped with a \$5000 fine per person
- with teeth – enforceable and with proper funding to make this happen
- protection for whistle blowers
- NO project should be exempt from the EA review processing

We need integrity and courage and a government we can trust that will do what is right and in the best interests of the people of BC so we and our children will inherit a planet that is liveable and sustainable and not detrimental to our health nor to the very existence of the human race.

=====

I want project reviews based on independent science and indigenous right.

=====

Please update our environmental laws so that we can meet our goal under the Paris accord. Seems like everyone is on board except Canada and the US and that is not acceptable. Our environment needs protection NOW and all projects should be reviewed prior to approval in consultation with scientists, First Nations and Canadian citizens.

We are supposed to be climate leaders and we owe that to our children and future generations. Canada Can and Must Do Better! Thank you!

=====

My family and community are in Victoria are looking for your leadership in changing how we do business in BC. We can lead the way to a new era of Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent.

We can be people our children and their children will be proud of .

=====

The polices and processes for environmental reviews in BC need to be reformed. My comments are as follows:

- meaningful participation with and consent from indigenous people in reviewing projects that impact their lands, waters and culture
- science based decisions including climate change impacts

- greater opportunities for citizen input
- more transparency in the process including corporate lobbying activities, meetings, political contributions (of all types), etc.

Anything short of the above amounts to further subsidies and results in unfair advantages to corporations -- ahead of the people you are mandated to support. Please consider this when implementing the new rules.

=====

I want large industrial project reviews based on independent science and Indigenous rights.

I want Environmental Assessment to:
Ensure more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborate with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

Thanks for considering my opinion on this matter!

I took an Environmental Assessment class at UBC and I'm enrolled in a bachelors of Geography at UBC. This matter is extremely important to me both professionally and personally.

=====

It seems clear to me--even just considering direct evidence from how resources are managed in my region--that our current environmental assessment process is entirely inadequate. I see evidence that resource extraction projects are not being subject to rigorous review, I have not felt that there was significant input invited from local (impacted) populations, and I have seen very little evidence that any amount of evidence of environmental impact actually results in projects being rejected or companies being held responsible for those impacts. I would support far more stringent legal regulation of companies profiting from our shared land.

=====

I understand that the BC Government is proposing an ambitious overhaul of the way we review pipelines and other projects in the province and I would like to take this opportunity to support the new shaping of the province's environmental assessment process.

In BC we have marine/intertidal ecosystems and many other types of environments (fresh water rivers/lakes, mountains, etc.) that support a wealth of nature's treasures -- including whales, wild salmon, herring and other species that enrich our lives in an infinite manner and in some cases supply us with food on our tables. Therefore, when pipelines or other projects are proposed I would like to see the most meticulous assessments in place. Specifically, the project would need absolute agreement and support from First Nations and other communities (substantive citizen input), and it would need to be supported by science of the greatest rigor (that generated by independent scientists, not "science" as defined by politics or politicians). A legislated climate test, Indigenous consent, and infinitely stronger monitoring

and enforcement should be required. In cases where it is simply not worth the inherent risks, and for which Indigenous consent is not secured, I would expect the project to be denied, and not “re-entertained”. There are always alternatives to achieving the same benefits, but reducing the impacts – and the future requires a view to sustainable energies and a different way of living. Above all we should have the mind set of looking forward to generations hundreds of years from now – and their rights to fresh air, fresh water, and safe food. Pipelines have a finite half-life, the risks to marine-, freshwater- and terrestrial- ecosystems are immense, and they further lock us in to old ways of garnering energy; this is inappropriate because new technologies for sustainable energy are being developed. Therefore, the most rigorous assessments for these and other projects using the parameters noted above are an absolute necessity – including assessments of potential negative impacts on human health – including mental health. The fact that BC is within an earthquake zone and that climate change has reached the global crisis level makes this re-shaping of the province’s environmental assessment process an exceedingly vital objective. Thank you for embarking upon this.

=====

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on proposed amendments to the Environmental Assessment Act.

I would like to see all new project proposals subject to an independent assessment that is based on scientific evidence and First Nations collaboration. The act should also include provisions for monitoring during and after completion of a project to ensure compliance with any regulations and restrictions; and should specify significant and enforceable penalties for noncompliance.

At a minimum, the assessment should include impact on global climate change, impact on local First Nations culture and economy, and impact on local waterways and wildlife. Any project that jeopardizes BC's climate targets, does not seriously consider independent scientific evidence, and does not honour UNDRIP's principle of free, prior and informed consent should be rejected.

=====

I strongly support updating our environmental laws so that common sense priorities, such as climate change, supercede big industry's financial interests. Environmental Issues should come first before decisions are made and have enough teeth in them, so they are not easily squashed by the deep pockets of lobbyists! I want project reviews that are based on independent science and keep indigenous people's rights in mind as well.

=====

I support stricter BC Environmental Assessment which includes
Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
More input from citizens and independent scientists
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent.
Please ensure that the "gold rush" mentality never happens in BC again. Please ensure that "free, prior, and informed" consent from affected First Nations is obtained before construction commences. And that includes the Trans Mountain Expansion Plan (TMX).

=====

Any environmental assessment should be independent and peer reviewed. Also First Nations should be consulted and their concerns addressed seriously and respected.

=====

Environmental assessments should require proposed projects to meet strict requirements to scientifically prove there will be no negative impact to the environment and that indigenous rights are fully protected.

=====

Ben Parfitt at Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and Adam Bailey at Dogwood need to be included in any environmental oversight. And those fish farms... they need to have their licenses revoked and the corporate owners fined to clean up the mess. Now.

You career politicians assume you can treat our land and waters like an open sewer. There's a special place in hell reserved just for you.

=====

Independent science and respect for indigenous rights have to be the twin cornerstones used in the examination of all pipeline and other projects affecting the environment. Please include these in every environmental assessment.

=====

I am urgently requesting that all projects affecting our environment be carefully reviewed with ample consideration of scientific studies and securing Indigenous consent.
Too often in the past our government has rubber-stamped approval of major projects that have had very detrimental effect on our environment.

=====

It is time to take better care of our environment now!
All projects should be thoroughly reviewed and collaboration with our First Nations is essential.
When citizens and scientists express their concerns response should be immediate.
It is time to take our climate targets seriously and to step up. Canada is being left behind.

=====

Yes, this matters & I would like BC to change their lax environmental regulations.. and I am shocked to hear that independent scientists are not already used on all projects.. I think more needs to be done.. no oil development. BC is one of the most beautiful areas in the world, we need to protect our resources,

wildlife, and health of our people from irreversible damage. No money in the world is worth so much environmental damage.

=====

I'm deeply concerned that the current environmental assessment process here in BC is more geared towards helping large companies to get what they want, and less on actual environmental protection. The whole point of the environmental review is to have a rigorous, science based approach that focuses solely on environmental and cultural impacts of the proposed project. Economic and social issues must be addressed separately.

I would like to see mid and large-scale projects go through thorough, multi-year reviews that look at long and short term impacts on river, coastal and marine ecosystems, wetlands, forests, and species at risk. Human health must be taken into account as well: impacts on air, water, and soil quality must be honestly predicted. Independent scientists (not industry funded) will do honest work, and it will be taken at face value. Consultations with local community and other shareholders will be open and valued. The project will be assessed truthfully and openly, not with a pre-determined end result that favours the corporation regardless.

Traditional ecological knowledge should come into play as well: Indigenous peoples have lived on this land for thousands of years and have an array of knowledge and historical references when it comes to systems change over time. With this comes the unfailing duty to preserve areas of cultural importance to Indigenous peoples.

Thank you for hearing me out. Here in BC we have so much natural beauty still left- most countries do not have this anymore. Please don't give this away.

=====

Thank you for taking big money out of political campaigning in B.C. Now it is time to strengthen our laws in favour of the environment and all it's inhabitants. It's time to keep our word to our Indigenous people and require their consent of projects that affect them and their lands. To not do this is to continue the generational act of colonization, something that I do not want to be tied to. You also need the public's consent and clearly the tide is changing. We are becoming more aware of what is at stake and less fearful of the proposed threats to our prosperity. We do not believe the lies any more. We will not bury our heads in the sand. Our voices will continue to rise until you deliver to us a fair governing that we are paying for. We respect the knowledge of our scientists and ask you to do the same. We respect the conclusions of the economists who know we cannot continue down a path of endless consumption without protection of the very resources we are consuming. We are fully aware of the insurance companies' stance on climate change. They only want to insure where they can profit and climate change is a loss to them. They can see it. You can see it. Let's do something about it!

=====

Please make the environmental assessment process legitimate, where the rights of First Nations peoples, the rights of the flora and fauna of the land also are considered. It is time now for the change to happen.

=====

I am writing in response to the invitation to comment on the proposed reform of the province's environmental assessment process.

The indications are the new proposals are moving in the right direction, but there are certain imperatives that must be included for a fair and inclusive process, and which is also fair to future generations.

1) There must be no provision for a project to be declared "exempt" from an assessment review, ever!

2) The reviews must include a climate test. This must include the upstream and downstream climate destroying emissions (in the case of oil and gas projects), not just the emissions released by the proposed project itself. The false, delusional idea that the burning of the fossil fuels by some other party in some other non-Canadian jurisdiction is "not our problem" is ludicrous. We all share the same atmosphere and climate. All Canadians, including our grandchildren, will suffer the consequences of a warmer planet and runaway climate change. We are all feeling the effects now. (Montreal has recently felt the extreme weather effects induced by climate changes this June and people have died.) There is no escape because the emissions are produced "elsewhere".

3) A key core purpose of the assessment must be the recognition of, and contextual implementation of, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP). In order to advance reconciliation with First Nations, there must be recognition of Indigenous nations as decision-makers in environmental assessment. For this to happen there must be meaningful engagement, including First Nations members on assessment panels where appropriate.

4) The current approach to assessment in BC – whereby the proponent generates virtually all the evidence, which is reviewed by an informal technical advisory group – is utterly inadequate and needs to end. A new assessment law must ensure a mandatory role in assessments for experts independent of provincial regulators and the proponent, as well as rigorous peer review of scientific and technical information.

5) It must also provide for Indigenous-led studies, and provide mechanisms to enable public participants to engage experts and test evidence, including early engagement requirements to ensure public participants proactively shape how this occurs.

6) The cumulative effect of all projects, locally, Regionally and Canada wide (in view of emissions targets under the Paris Agreement for example), must be considered. Environmental and ecological goals and standards at each level must be set and the assessment process must ensure that these are not undermined incrementally leading to "death by a thousand cuts".

7) Sustainability must be an assessment criteria. This means environmental and human health sustainability, not economic growth or profit sustainability, which all too often, the "sustainability" word has become corrupted to mean.

8) Assessment cannot continue to just be a process for making bad projects less bad before approving them. A new assessment law should require decision-makers to select the option from among reasonable alternatives that best protects Indigenous title and rights and safeguards health, ecological, cultural, social, and economic values. Options are very important, especially where public funds are involved. If an entirely different project approach will ensure attainment of health, climate, and environmental sustainability goals over the long term, then this option must be chosen even if the shareholder or company profits are sharply reduced. Large companies and investors must no longer be allowed to make profits, by mortgaging the future of young Canadians or the rest of humanity.

9) Finally, projects that fail to meet defined legislative sustainability and reconciliation criteria – including Indigenous consent, a climate test and respecting ecological limits – must not be approved at all under a new assessment law.

=====

I feel strongly that is time to update our environmental review process to take into account the triple bottom line of financial, social & environmental costs. We can no longer afford to make these decisions on the financial bottom line only...the costs are too great. Thanks for any movement that can be made to: review more projects, collaborate with the First Nations peoples, listen to independent scientists and not just those reporting for the corporations and reject projects that are not in line with B.C.'s climate targets. These targets can not just be words on paper...we need the actions to follow the intent!!!

=====

I have spent, personally, thousands of hours doing research, creating informative pamphlets, participating in workshops, etc. toward the goal of citizens knowing what is being proposed in our province and ensuring they can engage in the assessment discussion with confidence that they have knowledge of the issues. I would like to see environmental assessment reviews conducted with the passion and respect of all peoples, including those of the wider world who share our planet. A wholistic review, including carbon emissions of proposed projects is required in this critical age of climate change.

=====

I have spent, personally, thousands of hours doing research, creating informative pamphlets, participating in workshops, etc. toward the goal of citizens knowing what is being proposed in our province and ensuring they can engage in the assessment discussion with confidence that they have knowledge of the issues. I would like to see environmental assessment reviews conducted with the passion and respect of all peoples, including those of the wider world who share our planet. A wholistic review, including carbon emissions of proposed projects is required in this critical age of climate change.

=====

It's time to update our laws regarding resource extraction & the environmental review process.

We need :

- to ensure that all projects are actually reviewed.
- to collaborate with First Nations to lead joint assessments.
- more input from citizens & independent scientists.
- to reject projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets.
- to reject projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent or pass a climate test.
- to ensure independent evidence & oversight of assessments.
- to address cumulative effects within a region through more assessments & mandatory regional assessments.

Please stop rubber- stamping pipelines, mines, fracking & toxic waste sites with no regard for local communities or our environment.

=====

We need to fix our environmental laws in BC. The government needs to pay more attention to the input and concerns of affected communities and do thorough assessments.

Our BC government needs to reject projects that won't meet the BC climate targets and that don't have indigenous consent.

=====

Evidence could not be clearer that BC needs its own, independent EIA process for large-scale industrial projects. The federal process has failed to provide a stable model where businesses can proceed with certainty once the EIA is complete. Instead, the federal EIA appears to be a political process, where money is more important than merit, and results in expensive delays, protests, and court cases due to the spectacular failure of due process. As a province that has been a world leader in implementing a carbon tax, we must retain control over our EIA process to ensure:

- all projects actually receive a proper review;
- First Nations are properly included in jointly doing assessments, and that Indigenous consent becomes the bedrock standard for approving projects on unceded territories;
- local communities are properly consulted about projects that will impact them;
- the EIA process is based on evidence and science rather than politics and big money; and
- that climate impacts are properly incorporated in all EIAs to ensure BC maintains a leadership role in tackling climate change;

=====

As concerned British Columbian's we ask and urge you to please take into consideration all proposed projects are adequately reviewed by independent environmental studies and that all citizens of "Super Natural" B.C. are heard. We cannot afford to damage our environment and home any longer and lose what we will not be able to replace. There is no turning back once a catastrophe has happened. We implore you to carefully consider any decisions going forward that would harm our environment and consequently ourselves.

=====

I am writing to support strong and fundamental improvements to our environmental assessment procedures.

- All projects should come under environmental review.
- the environmental review should be conducted by independent and impartial science.
- include meaningful public participation, that is actually taken into consideration in the decision making process.
- provide for automatic rejection of projects that do not further BC's climate targets.
- insistence that, where relevant, projects gain indigenous consent in order to proceed.

=====

I strongly believe environmental law should be built around a synthesis of independent scientific research and basic respect for our surroundings. Consultation and collaboration with First Nations is absolutely crucial, as is their consent, and so is the input of other citizens of British Columbia. It's already too late to prevent climate disaster, but laws that serve the environment and the people (strict scientific review process, strict adherence to climate targets, respecting Indigenous consent or lack thereof,) rather than corporate interests might mitigate some of the damage. Thank you for your time.

=====

I fully agree with the direction proposed by the BC government. In this age of climate change and extreme environmental degradation, economic "Development" has to be strictly controlled and guidelines must be set and respected to the letter. Fully independent oversight, full Indigenous consent are the key pieces.

=====

We fully support all improvements to environmental reviews and assessments that take more into account science, indigenous rights and citizen's well being.

=====

For many years I have been very concerned with several aspects of the B.C. Environmental Assessment process:

- 1) the equating of consultation with First Nations as consent;
- 2) not considering the downstream CO2 contributions to the atmosphere; and,
- 3) using the flawed federal process as a substitute for our own B. C. assessment process.

In the case of my second point, I wonder how it is we still ship coal overseas. We should be working hard to give coal workers a just and fair transition to clean technologies. Also, the idea that fracking natural gas is clean is ludicrous, as you must know. Not only is groundwater contaminated, earthquakes generated, but leaks in the production, liquefaction and transport are a greater cause of global warming than burning the equivalent energy amount of coal.

It is time to get serious about protecting our environment. Really serious. Really, really serious.

I was a professional meteorologist for 40 years with Environment Canada and the Yukon Forest Service. I have been studying climate change for many, many years, and it is time to get really, really, really serious about it now, and not at some vague time in the future.

Let Sweden be your guide.

=====

As a tax payer and citizen of Canada I strongly urge you, Mr Minister and your staff to make the necessary changes in the laws regarding independant Environmental Assessment. It is essessential to do the public the service of have independent assessment vs company biased assessments. The risk to environment must be absolutely considered.

Consider the cost and damage created by an I cleanable oil spill on our western Canadian coast, it would be devastating to every aspect of life in BC and economically to Canada as a whole.

Do the right thing and change the laws to protect our environment by doing proper assessments!

=====

Please ensure that pipeline decisions are based on independent science. Please respect Indigenous rights. Please don't allow yourself to be bought by big oil. Please defend our planet. Please remember our children.

=====

Please be sure the following are included in your reviews:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I am writing to indicate my unwavering support for the strongest possible environmental laws in British Columbia. BC's environmental beauty and fragility make it a special place that must be protected through environmental laws and reviews of proposals that might negatively affect the environment. Our environmental laws should ensure that all projects are reviewed, that First Nations should co-lead assessments, allow for input by citizens and scientists, consider the impact of projects on climate change and BC's climate targets, and projects should only pass if they have Indigenous consent. Thank you for your work to improve BC's environmental laws.

=====

I fully support the changes suggested by the government to be included in a new Environmental Law.

From my own experience beginning in 1976 of setting up an environmental assessment process in the federal government department of Public Works and Government Services Canada to meet the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process, we began by including all physical projects and then over time eliminating those types of projects that consistently demonstrated they created no negative impacts in the physical and/or social environments. A list of these projects and any minor ameliorations that might occasionally be required were kept on file and used to eliminate projects from the EA process.

Likely the best Canadian environmental assessment that was ever done through the EARP process was the fixed link project to PEI, now known as Confederation Bridge. An Environmental Protection Plan was developed for the construction phase and opportunities to improve the environment, such as creating fish habitat around the piers where none previously existed, were implemented.

Please ensure that BC is well protected not only for the sake of our children but for all future generations.

=====

Like many British Columbians, I am not get resource projects per se but rather against those that have have not passed a rigorous screening to determine impact on our climate commitments, to ensure environmental safety (including clean-up at the end), that have not demonstrated they add to the broader public interest and those that do not have consensus buy-in from first nations. To this end, the following caveats seem relevant:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
 - Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
 - More input from citizens and independent scientists
 - Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
 - Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent
- =====

You are the Government of the people... NOT Corporations. We need UNBIASED environmental assessments. PERIOD

=====

As a member of the voting population of BC I believe that we, as electors of the government have a right to demand the standards the government applies to determining environmental assessment of proposed projects.

Therefore I request the Government of BC to:

Review all projects that have any environmental impact,
Reject all projects that will be contrary to ours or Canada's climate targets,
Reject all projects that do not consult with and gain consent from impacted Indigenous Peoples,
Look to the scientific community for input on proposed projects, and
Minimize the contact lobbyists have with government officials and bureaucrats to remove the temptation of said officials being swayed by personal gain. Let the project supporters present their plans in document form, the government can review, request clarification etc but no meetings at exclusive locations or during trips. Nothing that the average British Columbian would ever consider preferential treatment or a setting for temptation to occur. Please don't say that what I ask is impossible, all I ask is we the people of the province set the rules and call the shots, and not allow our representatives to be manipulated by those who seek to take advantage of our natural resources or geographic location.

Thank you for the opportunity to
share my thoughts.

=====

Thank you very much for your continued and committed excellent work over the Environmental issues ever since BC NDP took over the BC Government from BC Liberal lead by Gordon Campbell and Christy Clark. We ordinary people and Indigenous people in BC are totally depend on your Election Promises: CHANGE FOR THE BETTER BC !!! You are our HOPE to save us from WILD WEST environmental situation !!!

=====

As a concerned citizen of B.C. I can only hope that elected officials will thoroughly review the concerns of First Nations and conservationists before deciding to pollute our precious waters. Money/ profit needs to be looked at in its reality. Retraining, green industry, educating our decision makers needs to be the priority NOW.

4.5billion dollars of our money to something that is going to be useless in the near future is criminal

Please use your heads and your hearts

=====

Thanks for the opportunity to respond regarding the overhaul of the environmental review process. My view of the current way of doing things is that it reeks of industry control that puts profit and power ahead of the real protection of our environment. Integrity, real facts, and wisdom must underpin this process in order for good decisions to be made.

First and foremost, I believe that an environmental assessment must include these three areas of impact:

1. What is the impact on our precious water: does the proposal use too much of it (as in fracking and bottling processes), and/or does it create a risk to its quality (as in industrial leakages, and mining practices);
2. What is the overall impact on climate change in the world as well as our province's promised goals to achieve them; and
3. Does it uphold our moral and political responsibility to work with, consult, and respect Indigenous people, their lands, and their culture.

Failure to comply with any of these three critical criteria would result in rejection of the project.

Additionally, any scientific evidence used as the basis of a decision must be shown to be independent of any corporate interest or influence, ie: research is not funded or controlled by any corporation.

As well, more time and seating space at environmental reviews needs to be given for input from citizens, thinkers, and independent scientists.

Finally, rules must be in place to prevent industry from proceeding without environmental assessments such as what occurred with the many small dams that were built to hold back water supplies for the fracking industry.

I urge you to consider this review carefully, honestly and in good conscience for the benefit of our environment and our future on this planet.

=====

Honour the First Nations

=====

Please stop pressing for pipe lines to go through prior to an independent environmental assessment and all the indigenous rights are respected. Hard to believe that we live in Canada when these common sense responsible methods are not being followed through. Please follow through on your election platform as to what is best for Canadians.,especially for the people of BC who are right on the coast line!

=====

You need to listen to the citizens!
How, as elected representatives you can carry on ignoring climate change and it's causes is beyond belief. For God's sake listen to the scientists and not the industry paid scientists.
I had to buy an air conditioner today...something I never would have imagined doing.

=====

I urge you to pass legislation to fix BC's broken system of approving industrial projects without environmental reviews, or regard for the people affected by these projects.

It is time to ensure that government reviews do not just rubber stamp projects at the behest of lobbyists and corporate donors, but actually serve the people and communities who voted for them.

=====

Allow sufficient time to completely review more projects. Environmental laws must be firm, appropriate w/ability to be enforced.to avoid damage by industry such as fracking &anti-spawn fences. Avoid dispicable, erroneous circumstances of taxpayers paying for industry's errors i.e Mt. Polley mine. Evidence shows fracking to cause small earth tremors north of Site C dam. There is data about the extent fracking can impact our water underground. Firm laws needed now. Attend to all aspects not waiting till after thre fact irreversable damage. We expect you, our elected representatives, to protect & sustain our natural resources & to regulate their use by private industry which use our public resources for financial gain, on behalf of nearby ommunities & for benefit of all citizens. If more time to investigate or discuss, please take it.

=====

We need new and tougher environmental laws. Corporations have come first for too long and we need to intervene for the long term benefit of BC's environment and the thousands of ecosystems that depend on it!

=====

With regard to the review of the environmental assessment legislation, here are my comments.

Given the pattern of development of B.C. and its geography, mandated assessment of cumulative impacts

is essential, including for oil and gas developments consideration of upstream impacts. No more situations such as BC Hydro pretending there were no downstream impacts from the Bennet dam in the Athabasca Delta.

Included in this must be a consideration of climate change, what will be the impacts on release of GHG.

For mining projects there must be consideration of the feasibility of effective reclamation and remediation of site. No adequate possibility of remediation, as for selenium in Elk River, no project.

Full consideration must be given to FN views, no more Prosperity mine situations.

As government now does not appear to have the capability to undertake critical reviews or field work in relation to a proposal, then it should be required to engage outside professionals to undertake that work.

When a project is proposed, government should issue guidelines to the proponent advising of government's environmental objectives in the project area, so that both proponent and public have a preliminary understanding of the sensitivities.

Depending on the scale of the project, funds should be made available for public participation in the review.

=====

STOP excusing environmentally destructive projects from a proper review.
Shame on you.

=====

Stop allowing projects to happen that deepen our reliance on obsolete fuels and violate indigenous jurisdiction!

=====

Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments. No corporate interference or oversight. Sight inspection to insure no corporate short cuts are taken. Huge penalty's if infraction occurs to encourage project to be built to a high standard.

Provide more meaningful public participation.

Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments

Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected

=====

Climate alteration has to be at the top of every decision you make...

Decisions must be made with scientific evidence and no project should be approved if it would cause us NOT to meet our climate targets. Projects need to secure Indigenous consent, the approval process needs

to follow a process that includes joint assessments collaborating with First Nations, and independent review from independent scientists.

We cannot wait any longer to address the climate alteration we are causing with fossil fuels. All projects must be subject to a proper review process that follows due process and is transparent.

=====

I am a BC Voter who feels that all project reviews must be subject to scientific reviews, and the project must also respect First Nations views when crossing their lands.

The Mount Polley mine disaster and lack of any court action was an insult to all British Columbians, and is an example of what cannot be allowed to happen in BC. The government, representing the people should still be held accountable.

Among other things, I want to see:

More projects reviewed,

More input from First Nations, citizens, and scientists.

Rejection of projects that would blow BC's climate targets, and /or fail to secure Indigenous consent.

=====

Canadians need, and deserve, a proper environmental review process for all resource based endeavours-- one that is honest and transparent, unlike the National Energy Board.

=====

The environment and BC Coastlines are extremely important to me and all British Columbians. The value our environment brings in both monetary value and intrinsic value is not replaceable and is not worth the risks by increasing tanker traffic and oil spills. The coast where the Exxon Valdez spill occurred has never recovered. We already have enough mines leaking toxic substances into our waters.

We need to stand strong and say it is not worth the risk. Our focus should be on curbing climate change which threatens all of BC as well as the globe. Please ensure that critical criteria for ensuring climate change targets are met and the environment is protected based on science are the deciding factors in assessments.

=====

I am begging you to start an environmental review process that is logical and independently, scientifically based to assess all projects in B.C.

It is very important that lobbyists and back room deals can not influence the acceptance process.

Please make sure that all proposed projects that will keep us from meeting our climate targets are rejected.

Please make sure that all projects that do not have Indigenous consent are rejected.

Allow the people of British Columbia to be involved in the assessment process.

=====

We are called Beautiful British Columbia for a reason but time is of the essence and we need to have much stronger environmental laws and policies in place to protect our province from the exploitation of big oil, gas and mining industries; laws that protect and make our environment the priority. Right now there is no accountability for unlawful actions. A Texan oil company should not have the right to come into our province and mess with our salmon and trample indigenous voices and rights with no consequences. We need to protect BC before we have nothing left. It's time to stop exploiting our natural resources for big money that cares nothing for this beautiful place we call home. I want BC to be a leader in climate change, a protector of indigenous rights and a place where our future generations can continue to enjoy our beautiful province for many many years to come. Please protect BC now.

=====

It is now time for change. We must ensure that:

- *All projects are actually reviewed;
 - * There is clear collaboration with First Nations to lead joint assessments;
 - * More input from citizens and independent scientists
 - * Projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets are rejected; and
 - * That projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent are rejected.
- =====

Resource extraction is fine, but externalized costs are not. If a company cannot afford the clean-up, then they shouldn't be allowed to make the mess.

=====

As a BC resident I hope to live in this beautiful province for the rest of my life. I know you do too. Please ensure that it remains beautiful place for generations to come. This means

- all corporate projects must conform to citizen standards
 - Indigenous rights are held in the highest regard
 - all projects must conform to cleanup standards as established by independent scientists, not corporation paid scientists
 - BC is working towards the climate targets and rejecting projects that do not help us meet those goals
 - ensure that ALL projects go through a democratically involved process
- that is science based, inclusive, community centred, and democratic
- =====

I was very happy to see the BC government request public consultation on environmental reform. For too long, the oil lobby has invested in persuading decision makers in this province to support their agenda, rather than considering the wishes of the residents.

It should come as no surprise to find out that most of us want fair and unbiased project reviews based solely upon independent, main-stream science and respecting the Indigenous rights of our First Nations.

This province is comprised of people who value the earth and its indigenous species, who were here long

before us and leave a small footprint on the landscape. Tourism is a booming business based on the world's fascination and love of those species and the diversity and pristine nature of our landscape. Just us we do.

Most of us are happy to live in a country where, most of the time, facts determine decisions. Obviously, to make decisions without considering facts is a dangerous way to conduct business - or to live life.

It's far past the time when B.C. can continue to rubber-stamp pipelines without considering the environment and climate change. It's foolish to ignore the facts and exempt fracking and mining projects from review. Yet that's the system in play today.

I look back at my long life and wonder how we got into this counter-intuitive situation. The only answer is that it only works well for the companies it serves and the politicians who support them by their actions. Sadly, that required giving lots of campaign money to reward politicians who support the money-givers requests, as has happened here. Supposedly those corporate donations are now illegal. But that hasn't changed the results - just the method of delivering the lobby money.

When did politicians decide not to listen to their constituents? Why do they value corporations with free-flowing money more than the interests of their people? These are troubling times indeed, as the only answer that fits is "greed".

Let's change the unspoken rules of the game. I ask you to consider climate change, the danger of transporting and leaking the caustic chemical slush currently called "oil", and the ramifications to the earth itself from fracking, all of which adversely effect the health of our earthly home and its occupants.

We cannot continue to soil our own or our neighbour's nests. Research the effects of fracking and the dangers of a spill of fracked oil on everyone from Alberta to China. This world and the life it holds needs every chance it can get to survive and thrive and our current track record is appalling.

Please use only fact and fact-based reason from unbiased Environmental Assessments - past and present, here and elsewhere - when you make a decision potentially affecting so much.

Thank you for your honest consideration.

=====

We can not let the industry govern themselves.

We need this done for the next generation.

=====

While the environment becomes destroyed in British Columbia and our water is becoming poisoned we need to begin to hold those people who are responsible for doing us harm are held accountable for their actions. We definitely need a major overhaul that will prevent the exchange of cash for favours. All Environmental projects need to be subjected to strict environmental reviews and assessments. We need to have meaningful input from citizens and independent scientists. I believe all citizens of B.C. need to have meaningful input into environmental issues that have a possibility of destroying our environment and

increasing our inability to reach climate targets. we need to take a good look at what damage has been done by the B.C. Liberal Party and the Federal Conservative and Liberal Parties.

=====

For years B.C. rubber-stamped pipelines, mines, fracking and toxic waste sites with little regard for local communities. These items need to be included in the process for future generations to benefit from a clean environment:

Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments.
More input from citizens and independent scientists.
Rejection of projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets.
Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent.

Please consider these in your decision making.

=====

It's time to fix BC's environmental laws.

Our next-generation environmental assessment law must:

1. Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments.
2. Provide more meaningful public participation and participant funding.
3. Address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments.
4. Ensure projects that don't meet important legal criteria – including a climate test and Indigenous consent – are rejected.

We encourage BC to follow through on its proposals to legally establish:

1. A purpose provision in the new assessment law that includes protection of the environment, fostering sustainability, and implementation of UNDRIP as core purposes of assessment.
2. An early engagement phase for each assessment that results in a collaboratively-developed Assessment Plan, informed by public engagement, to set out the scope, procedures and methods for assessment, as well as how provincial and Indigenous processes and decision-making will align, including funding, timelines, and opportunities for public participation.
3. Legislative factors and criteria that assessments and assessment decisions must be based on, as well as a requirement to give reasons for a decision, to ensure transparency and accountability.
4. More opportunities for early and ongoing public participation, including types of engagement beyond traditional comment periods, and a public participation funding program.
5. Transparent online posting of all assessment information (except sensitive Indigenous knowledge), including plain language materials and monitoring and compliance information.
6. Recognition of Indigenous nations as decision-makers in environmental assessment.
7. A new Reconciliation Commission to assist with dispute resolution regarding implementation of UNDRIP in assessments.
8. Requirements to assess effects on vulnerable populations, including gender analysis and impacts specific to Indigenous women and girls.
9. A legal framework and funding for regional and strategic assessment to address “big picture” issues such as managing cumulative effects, including criteria for prioritizing regions for assessment.
10. New tools for monitoring, compliance and enforcement, including links with the role of Indigenous

guardian programs, and continuing engagement of public participants in compliance and enforcement.

If the following issues are not meaningfully addressed through legislative reform, BC will fail to meet its goals of enhancing public confidence, advancing reconciliation, and protecting the environment in relation to assessments. BC needs to go further to ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments.

The current approach to assessment in BC – whereby the proponent generates virtually all the evidence, which is reviewed by an informal technical advisory group – is inadequate and needs to end.

A new assessment law must ensure a mandatory role in assessments for experts independent of provincial regulators and the proponent, as well as rigorous peer review of scientific and technical information. It must also provide for Indigenous-led studies, and provide mechanisms to enable public participants to engage experts and test evidence, including early engagement requirements to ensure public participants proactively shape how this occurs.

Regional “Reconciliation” or “Sustainability” offices proposed in the Discussion Paper should be implemented as independent science centres to assist with generating, overseeing and/or peer reviewing scientific evidence in project and regional assessments, in balance with Indigenous knowledge.

Projects must be rejected if they don’t meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent.

Assessment can’t continue to just be a process for making bad projects less bad before approving them. A new assessment law should require decision-makers to select the option from among reasonable alternatives that best protects Indigenous title and rights and safeguards ecological, cultural, social, economic and health values. This must include the option of not proceeding with the proposal.

Projects that fail to meet defined legislative sustainability and reconciliation criteria – including Indigenous consent, a climate test and respecting ecological limits – must not be approved under a new assessment law.

=====

I want an independent, objective assessment of pipelines and other projects which will impact the environment.

=====

I definitely want to see the environmental assessment process strengthened to protect the environment and communities. There has been FAR TOO MUCH input from the business community encouraging things to be lax and encouraging NOT looking at cumulative impacts.

It is VITAL to look at the cumulative impacts of all existing activity in order to properly assess whether an expansion or new activity is wise.

It is important to me that climate change be looked at as a SERIOUS threat and that steps be taken to include impacts on climate change within all assessments.

It is absolutely shameful that the company owning the Mt Polley mine is still doing business. They ought to be bankrupted from paying for the extensive clean-up still required as that tailings pond breach

continues to affect Fraser River salmon. Companies MUST be held financially accountable for pollution.

OLD GROWTH FOREST systems should not be impacted with further logging. The whole forest floor is interconnected and the oldest trees are critical to the survival of the biodiversity within the forest.

I have been shocked to learn how "resource-friendly" BC is compared to other places in the country. I want regulations tightened up so that the water, air, land is MUCH better protected than it has been since white folks came along.

And on that note, I support a rejection of all projects that fail to secure majority Indigenous support from the whole tribe(s) affected ~ not just the decision of either the elected or hereditary chiefs and councils.

I encourage more input in assessments from independent scientists and citizens.

It is totally shameful that pollution and environmental tampering are so poorly penalized to the offending companies. That Kinder Morgan paid only a \$230 fine for illegally tampering with salmon spawning streams is WRONG.

We need an environmental review process in line with 21st century science, legal realities and social values ~ which are shifting to global responsibility and interconnectedness and caring FOR nature and restoring harmed natural habitats. One that considers sustainability, climate, biodiversity and human rights.

Projects incompatible with our shared survival – or unable to secure basic consent from the people most affected – need to be rejected.

=====

I am a former member of the Environmental Advisory Commission of the Central Okanagan Regional District and a longtime observer of mega projects and natural assets.

Have been deeply concerned for years that environmental assessments are often woefully inadequate in the face of economic pressures; have seen time and time again various assessments carried out with full knowledge they will be filed and ignored. As the mother of three voters who are on their thirties, I am upset that their generation will be left to clear up or cope with my generation's many brutally self-serving projects and their negative long term costs.

=====

As the time nears to update the process for conducting environmental reviews, I ask the BC government to make Indigenous reconciliation and the environment a priority.

At a minimum please:

- Collaborate with First Nations
- Require independent 3rd party reviews (environmental assessments)
- Focus on alternative energy (make it legal for other organizations to sell power- not just BC Hydro)
- Focus on helping Canada and the world achieve our carbon reduction goals.

For the love of our children,

=====

I am writing to express my deepest support in overhauling the environmental review process of resource developments in BC. Canadians deserve to have a strong, independent and science based process that puts communities and the environment as a top priority. We must ensure that more projects are actually reviewed, collaborate with First Nations in the assessment process, have more input from citizens and independent scientists and a transparent and accountable approach. Any project that blows BC's climate targets should be rejected. Any project that fails First Nation consent should be rejected. Corporations must be held accountable both responsibly and financially when a disaster strikes. The Mount Polley Mine disaster comes to mind in the wake of this overhaul. We have a company who repeatedly violated laws and safety protocols, sending millions of cubic meters of toxic sludge into Lake Quesnel, destroying entire ecosystems, fish habitat, and drinking water, causing significant financial and environmental damage and yet we have not seen any punishment or reprimand regarding this historic disaster, even financially. This is unacceptable and frankly an eye popping head shaker that companies like this get nothing but a slap on the wrist and continue to run this mine. I am mind boggled that a person driving a car will get more penalties for speeding and causing no harm than a company that created a historic environmental disaster in our Province. BC is the wild west of resource extraction and its time to update our laws to protect people, the environment and keep our Province clean and healthy. Please update our environmental review process and make it strict and sincere for Canadians and our next generations sake. Thank you

=====

I am writing to let you know I support the overhaul to how the BC gov't engages environmental reviews. This is vital to us moving forward in a more sustainable way. Across the board, all projects NEED to be reviewed fully and there NEEDS to be more input from the people, and also from independent scientists. Also, the gov't NEEDS to collaborate with First Nations and make joint assessments. AND... any project which undermines BC's climate targets and that fail to secure First Nations consent, NEEDS to be rejected.

=====

As a lifelong resident of this province, I am writing to express my strong support for an improved environmental assessment process in BC.

I believe that our existing environmental protections are too weak. Projects that cause significant environmental harm have often been approved here because the corporations behind them have donated heavily to the party in power. Other projects that should have been reviewed here -- such as the Kinder Morgan Pipeline -- were able to be exempted for proper review for similar reasons.

There is a great deal of room for improvement. For example, it is my understanding that the impact of climate change is not adequately addressed in the current legislation. Furthermore, indigenous rights and the impact on endangered species can still be ignored. Finally, there needs to be more input from

I am encouraged to know that the Provincial Government is looking at changes that will address these kinds of challenges.

=====

I welcome the proposed changes in BC's environmental assessment process, as outlined in your discussion paper.

I would urge that you pay particular attention to making sure the process is fully transparent and accountable, and involves independent expert review - with NO exceptions. The idea of regional centres is a good one as long as they are funded and staffed to allow for a level of independent expertise.

I salute your commitment to collaboration with First Nations. It is vital that they be involved in designing the process itself, and especially the process of consultation and the membership of the assessment panels.

The process should make it easier to reject projects that do not meet defined sustainability criteria, while giving good projects a fair and constructive hearing.

Thank you for moving ahead with this vitally important file.

=====

Please add to the Environmental Assessment that all projects are required to include the upstream and downstream affects on the environment.

I would also like to see included in the review that it looks at any alternatives to the project being assessed.

=====

It might take courage, but project reviews should stipulate that a minimum of 5% (?) annually be put into a trust to ensure clean up, reclamation and decontamination be funded by the corporations doing the project. No profits should leave the Province (Country) until all criteria have been met. Review bodies must be independent from political or lobbying influences, and they are to be aware that future employment by oil companies is not allowed. Indigenous consent must include full disclosure of all aspects of the project, including financial, subsidies and tax agreements. Citizens Must be given the full disclosure as above, and financial and environmental impacts must be made public.

=====

I want reviews that involve First Nations, but most specifically independent scientists. Things need to change in BC. The years of power money making the rules have to stop, for the sake of our ecology, future and planet. Thank you

=====

I wish to add my voice to those asking that the rules for environmental assessments guarantee that the effect of any project on climate change will be a serious consideration and that projects will be rejected if they reduce BC's ability to meet our climate targets.

ALL projects should be considered - especially fracking and mining, as well as the transport and production of oil and gas.

There should be an opportunity for all concerned individuals and scientists to contribute to the assessment.

And it should be a foregone conclusion that Indigenous consent is required and that First Nations representatives take part in the assessments.

=====

The NDP government must do all in its power to make revised/ revitalised laws on environmental assessment that reflect concerns stated by such organisations as West Coast Environmental Law and Dogwood. The law should require that all projects be reviewed by independent experts committed to evidence-based science, whose first concern is to sustain and promote a healthy environment. Such assessors must be independent of government and of industry. Now is the time to put an end to old systems in which the entrepreneurs / industry provide the information to be reviewed and assess the effects of their proposals on the environment. Qualified, independent reviewers must have the power to engage in environmental assessments without interference and their findings must be binding. Governments, including the present government of BC, must ensure that all parties, including First Nations are consulted and that serious objections are investigated. UNDRIP must be implemented in the revised law. Transparency and accountability must be guaranteed. Public hearings in which those affected by proposed changes are properly heard and their views taken into account when decisions are made must be assured. There must be no more secret negotiations between industry and government. Justice to the environment and hence to all citizens must be the first -- and last -- requirement.

=====

Please respect Article 35 of the Canadian constitutions and UNDRIP in its entirety and not a watered down version. Hold independent environment inquiries that include all pollution created by a project, upstream and downstream. Stop adding more pollution and creating climate genocide for the coming generations.

=====

The ridiculous practice of having self-assessments done by companies for environmental issues must stop.

The irony of having "the fox guard the hen house" is obvious with what has happened in BC. Mount Polley is a prime example - has the company been taken to task for their blatant neglect? No! When will large corporations which are capable of doing the most environmental damage be held responsible? The days of free for all mentality have to stop! Having money should not give unlimited power to do as you please when it effects us all.

=====

There is something rotten at work in BC.

It's the way we, as a society, choose where to put our collective energy. Our government's role of safeguarding people and the environment has been undermined by those with only profits as their core motivation.

Environmental assessments have not been conducted taking a long-term approach. They have not taken into account the true history of a place essentially stolen from Indigenous peoples. They have not followed the science to make decisions given the dire consequences of climate change.

They are failing us and our links to the planet we live on, and they must be revitalized, protected from corruption and rampant self-regulation, and they must be rebuilt on a foundation of true Indigenous consent.

=====

I am strongly in favour of rigorous environmental reviews and free prior and informed consent from indigenous nations for any projects being considered. I am appalled by our current system and projects which are being allowed under it.

=====

It's beautiful BC for a reason; in fact, several reasons. In order to protect what makes BC beautiful, we should enact the world's most stringent environmental legislation. And we should make it unmistakably clear to the Federal government that our obligations to BC's First Nations and the environment outweigh any self-righteous demands by industry or other provincial jurisdictions.

=====

I want to see real honouring of Indigenous rights. I want to see environmental needs (the best interests of Canadians) set above corporate needs. I want to see BC sticking to policies which will support Canada meeting its climate targets regardless of what other provinces do. Always keep in mind that jobs can be redirected. We don't have to be a one-trick pony.

=====

For the love of our planet and safety of future generations please put people before profits and the environmentally destructive demands of big oil.

Independent Environmental Assessments are necessary and mandatory before any of these projects should be allowed to proceed.

One Planet One People

=====

Hello - I am writing to let you know that we need much stronger environmentaldecure laws in place. Ahead of that we need to follow the UNDRIP protocols for free, prior and informed consent of the

Indigenous people of this land. Truth Before Reconciliation.

We need all of these things for our children's ability to reach their fullest potential and to be able to live healthy, fulfilled lives.

As you should all be considering.

=====

I would like to see all five goals as listed in the Dogwood letter, be enshrined in law as soon as possible. We have already had enough debate on the topics listed; let's get them on the table, discussed as much as necessary and passed into law.

=====

I believe we finally have a government in Victoria that wants to do the right thing, and wants to listen to the will of the people. I think for most people in British Columbia, that means having a clean, safe environment to live in and to raise their families in. This place is not called 'Beautiful BC' for nothing, but we will need to work to keep it that way.

We can't continue to rubber stamp environmental approval for potentially damaging projects, as the previous Liberal government did for years, with no regard to the wishes of the electorate or the health of the environment.

We need only to look at failures such as Mount Polley, or Kinder Morgan's illegal anti-spawning fences, to find recent examples of government failure to provide the necessary oversight.

We need a complete consultation process that allows input from BC citizens and independent scientists. Perhaps more importantly, our First Nations need to be consulted on these projects. They have been ignored far too long, and perhaps as much or more than anyone have the best interests of the environment in mind. If First Nations says no to an environmentally sensitive project, that should be all it takes for it to be rejected.

We should also reject any projects that will contribute to climate change and have a negative impact on BC's climate targets.

For those projects that are rejected, there should be a moratorium of at least 5 years placed on re-submitting applications by the entity that originally applied. For example, it is ridiculous that Taseko mining continues to re-apply for the environmentally irresponsible Fish Lake mining project. By doing so they continue to waste taxpayers' time and money to review a project that was already rejected not once, but twice. For a company to change the parameters of the project should not be enough. If it is rejected once, then they should have to wait. Even a 10 year moratorium might be better than a 5 year moratorium.

Such reviews should also extend to projects such as open-net salmon farming. Numerous studies by leading scientists have concluded that these farms are hazardous to marine life, including the vital salmon runs that are the cornerstone of BC's natural world and are currently endangered in many areas.

BC has a chance to be a leader in Canada in environmental protection with changes to our environmental review laws. Indeed, the Federal government has abdicated its responsibilities in that regard, and it appears our neighbors in Alberta never had any to begin with.

Please overhaul our laws to make environmental reviews much more robust and help protect what helps make BC a unique and great place to live.

=====

I am tired of you pretending to do comprehensive environmental assessments that do not respect the will of the people affected by the projects. Dont be the EPA of the North - tighten rules, review using science not oil company stats, reject projects that contribute to climate change, respect First Nations and quit pretending that economic performance will be compromised by environmental protection. You are supposed to be NPD and GREEN, so start acting like it. We all know that unless we protect the environment and stop climate change, our species is doomed. GET TOUGH!

=====

I feel more consultation and assessment by independent groups should be done to ensure mining and oil developments do not negatively impact our province.

I have significant concerns about the validity of the research presented concerning the pipeline project, specifically the potential impact of the transportation of crude oil on BC waterways.

It seems like insufficient research has been conducted on bitumen and that the KM report assumes bitumen behaves in the same way as other crude oil in the event of a spill along BC coastlines. Nor has there been enough of a plan outlined for dealing with spills, which, frankly, is inevitable.

Tourism is one of the leading industries in BC. It is the BC government's duty to ensure development of mining and oil industries will not adversely impact the beauty of our province.

=====

We all need to take responsibility for the care and maintenance of our home here in BC. We all need the information of the proposals for anything that would affect any of us. We need to stop any projects that do not have consent of indigenous peoples and of those who will be impacted -- which ultimately is all of us.

=====

please get some proper assessments happening. Our current system only helps the rich corporations. Consider first nations!

=====

Please update the environmental review process to properly reflect science and indigenous rights and title. Don't let the corporations run our province or our country!

=====

Climate Change must be a major consideration when reviewing major industrial projects especially oil and gas of all types.

=====

It is time for the NDP and the Green Party to stand behind what I believe they stand for and that is for the people's right to clean air, clean water, a clean environment and a future where climate change is not a threat to the existence of the human race. Recent history in the province has shown that environmental accidents happen even with safeguards. We need to conduct rigorous science-based assessments of all construction projects that could impact the environment. In addition First Nations must be involved in this review process. Now is the time to pass legislation to protect our future. Big money and corporations will only find ways to continue to profit without these protections in place.

=====

I support a thorough overhaul of BC's environmental protection laws. If not now, when?

=====

I strongly believe that BC should tighten their environmental laws by ensuring that these projects, that benefit the large corporations but not the residences of BC, are properly reviewed by BC's public. The First Nations should lead in the joint assessments as should independent scientists. I reject projects that will endanger BC's climate targets and fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I think there should be input from scientists (independent), First Nations and citizens before any project that could have an impact on our environment is approved.

=====

First Nation (Indigenous) consent on all projects that require an environmental assessment.

A review by an independent board of specialists (accredited professionals) on all projects that require an environmental assessment.

Proposals for alternative solutions.

A ban on any proposals that could have a negative effect on existing natural resources, i.e. fish, water.

Public consultation and input on the assessment process.

=====

I have so little trust in this review process for I feel all has been manipulated. Even words and concepts seem to be been altered to have new meanings. So first of define all concepts in the process (ex collaboration; the public etc) Project reviews should be ongoing, not just the bigger ones that the public are alerted to;

Ensure First Nations participation in joint assessments.

Input from independent scientists

Any project should contain detailed costed out information and data about how any accident will be dealt with. ie. who will pay how much and who or which group determines the issue has been remediated.

History of company, (including past grievances and how the company performed) submitting a proposal should be included for assessment.

Projects that don't meet our climate targets or fail to secure First Nations consent should be rejected.

=====

First Nation (Indigenous) consent on all projects that require an environmental assessment.

A review by an independent board of specialists (accredited professionals) on all projects that require an environmental assessment.

Proposals for alternative solutions.

A ban on any proposals that could have a negative effect on existing natural resources, i.e. fish, water.

Public consultation and input on the assessment process.

=====

Its time to fix BC's broken environmental laws!!

Its time for project reviews to be based on independant science and indigenous rights:

- All major projects should be subject to environmental review. No projects should exempt.
- rejection of projects that would prevent BC from making its climate targets
- rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent
- more input from citizens and independant scientists
- more input from local communities affected by projects
- ensure independant evidence and oversight of projects
- provide more meaningful public consultation
- address cumulative affects within a region

=====

Thanks for doing this review. I hope it is not another governmental game of smoke and mirrors.

Environmental reviews should start and end on the bedrock of science and respect for indigenous rights.

The science must itself be based on the precautionary principle, especially as regards climate change. No bafflegab about green tar sands pipelines or clean LNG. No "conflicting" financial considerations about completing demonstrably harmful projects (like Site C) because their centuries-long negative effects are somehow outweighed by short-term bookkeeping considerations.

And respect for indigenous rights means free, prior and informed consent for each independent nation, not some scorecard on a regional, provincial, or national basis--whatever is convenient to false claims that consent by some means consent by all. The UN Declaration on Indigenous Peoples is the law!

Also, when projects are being reviewed and public comments being sought, sending out thorough, balanced information to people via media and mail would be essential to making those informed comments.

=====

I am writing because I feel it is my civic duty to speak out when government policies are wrong. For decades, our provincial government has been far too accepting of resource extraction projects, accepting the mantra of jobs and money to be made, but not considering the full costs, in terms of human and environment.

I fully agree with the BC government's plans to base project reviews on real science, to reject projects that would not comply with climate targets, and to reject any projects that do not have consent from indigenous peoples.

Further, all reviews must allow for real input from the people, and that input must be truly considered.

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes. Early engagement, meaningful public participation and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

However, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes. Early engagement, meaningful public participation and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

However, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

=====

I would like to see a reformed assessment system, under which more projects must be reviewed, and a system of collaborative assessments with First Nations consistently brought in.

If any project does not get *genuine* consent from the Indigenous communities on whose traditional territories it would operate, it should be rejected. period.

There also should be more input in general from independent scientists and the public.

=====

BC's 2002 Environmental Assessment Act is astoudingly inadequate.

The BC Liberal government rubber-stamped the Trans Mountain pipeline, the Site C dam, a toxic waste dump in Shawnigan Lake and the New Prosperity Mine.

BC needs an environmental review process in line with 21st century science, legal realities and social values. One that considers sustainability, climate, biodiversity and human rights.

We need environmental assessment which ensures more projects are reviewed; collaboration with First Nations leading to joint assessment; includes more input from citizens and independent scientists; rejection of projects that blow BC's climate targets; and rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent.

=====

BC needs to go further to ensure:

Independent evidence and oversight of assessments

The current approach to assessment in BC – whereby the proponent generates virtually all the evidence, which is reviewed by an informal technical advisory group – is inadequate and needs to end.

A new assessment law must ensure a mandatory role in assessments for experts independent of provincial regulators and the proponent, as well as rigorous peer review of scientific and technical information. It must also provide for Indigenous-led studies, and provide mechanisms to enable public participants to engage experts and test evidence, including early engagement requirements to ensure public participants proactively shape how this occurs.

Regional “Reconciliation” or “Sustainability” offices proposed in the Discussion Paper should be implemented as independent science centres to assist with generating, overseeing and/or peer reviewing scientific evidence in project and regional assessments, in balance with Indigenous knowledge.

Unless otherwise determined through collaboratively developed Assessment Plans and related government-to-government agreements, independent or Indigenous-led panels should be the default for assessment.

Outcomes from key assessment stages, such as the assessment report and recommendations, and Ministers’ decision on whether to approve a project, should be clearly subject to appeal to ensure transparency and accountability.

More meaningful public participation and participant funding

Legislation should establish public hearings as a default component of the assessment process.

Public engagement must be led by the body conducting the assessment – not the proponent.

A public participation funding program should be established in legislation to ensure sufficient funding is reliably and independently distributed.

Cumulative effects are addressed through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments

The legal criteria for which projects get assessed must be broadened beyond current, narrow thresholds based on production-capacity (e.g. the amount of mineral ore that a mine plans to produce each year).

Instead, all projects that stand to impact sustainability must be assessed; to help ensure this, legislation should provide a mechanism for the public and Indigenous peoples to trigger assessments.

The ability to exempt projects from assessment must be removed.

Legislation should provide triggers and requirements for regional assessments, which would establish a legally binding “floor” for environmental protection that applies to project assessments and provincial decisions in the region.

Projects are rejected if they don’t meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

Assessment can’t continue to just be a process for making bad projects less bad before approving them. A new assessment law should require decision-makers to select the option from among reasonable alternatives that best protects Indigenous title and rights and safeguards ecological, cultural, social, economic and health values.

This must include the option of not proceeding with the proposal.
Projects that fail to meet defined legislative sustainability and reconciliation criteria – including Indigenous consent, a climate test and respecting ecological limits – must not be approved under a new assessment law.

=====

thank you for giving the Environment Assessment Office the task to initiate an environmental review process. It is extremely needed!

I would like to see clear and strong laws to make sure that only those projects will proceed that adhere to the following:

- each project will be reviewed
- each project will be based on independent science.
- the general public will be informed about each project.
- collaboration with indigenous people will be part of the process.
- a project will be rejected if it undermines BC's climate target.
- each project will be looked at from a perspective whether an alternative of a sustainable nature can be applied.

I also feel strongly that self- regulation by the company needs to be stopped; it has been proven to be most ineffective. Indeed, this needs to be replaced by a clear and strong public and scientifically based environmental review process.

=====

All projects with potential for environmental impact should be reviewed by unbiased independent bodies and backed up by scientific studies and knowledge.

Permission of first nations should be required on all projects on their land or on land involved in territory disputes.

Under no conditions should any source of drinking water be threatened - this is becoming an increasingly important resource and we would be wise to protect it.

Any proposal should include a plan for cleaning up at the conclusion of its operation. A commitment and downpayment should be made for this inevitable cost.
If the clean up plan does not return the land to its original condition then a cost should be assigned to this loss of resource and paid by the company causing it.

All projects should support BC climate targets.

=====

I would like to add my voice to those who seek improved environmental assessments that consider independent peer-reviewed scientific evidence, and that are more transparent. Hopefully, legislation to protect the environment will not be watered down due to influence peddling by corporations. Ideally, the review process would be adequately funded, in order to include broad public participation and to support professional research.

=====

We must:

Ensure all projects are actually reviewed
Collaborate with First Nations to lead joint assessments
Have more input from citizens and independent scientists
Reject projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
Reject projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

Thank you for seeking input from the public regarding how BC will conduct environmental reviews. It is essential that the government move away from the a system that favors corporate interests over public interest. I strongly support changes that include:

- Ensuring more projects are actually reviewed
- Collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- More input from citizens and independent scientists
- Rejection of projects that would undermine B.C.'s climate targets
- Rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent. This is fundamental to ensuring a respectful approach to environmental reviews.

=====

I ask that you develop robust guidelines and policies for protecting our environment (including climate), now and for future generations. This includes full environmental and social impact assessments, collaboration with Indigenous groups, rejection of projects that break thresholds, and increased support for green alternatives in both the private and public sectors. Please ensure that we build a more just and sustainable future in BC!

=====

First let me congratulate you and the government on banning corporate donations which have unduly influenced good science based environmental assessments and project decisions for decades in this province. Also let me commend you on efforts to reform environmental assessment legislation in this province which was eviscerated by the previous liberal governments. These steps are long overdue. As a retired government biologist who worked in environmental assessments for almost 30 years I personally know how disturbing it is to civil servants (who do an excellent job of providing independent science based reviews of the environmental impact evaluations and assessments produced and provided by corporate proponents) to be ignored. Big money and political influence has too often trumped good science leaving not only staff but the public wondering "who is actually in charge". Independent reviews of corporate environmental assessments is essential if governments are to be trusted

to uphold the broader public interest in protecting our natural environments, our unique and important wildlife and fish species, our climate and our safety and health. Transparency and ultimately accountability for the final decision is also essential as people are tired of having to roll up their sleeves and fight the fight that they elect politicians and pay civil servants to do on their behalf. Imposition of deadlines for completion of assessments has led to proponents dragging their feet in addressing deficiencies or inaccuracies and very long and convoluted processes that frustrate all involved. The “clock” for a decision should not start until staff can conclude that accurate and complete information has been provided.

These are simply a few recommendations for consideration during reform of BC’s environmental assessment legislation.

Good luck.

=====

I believe it is vitally important to ensure a fair and independent review of all projects that consider scientific perspective and indigenous rights. I support the government's move to move away from 'rubber stamping' projects to actually looking at environmental concerns.

=====

The review process must be more robust and include communities in the process. Companies and projects should be paying to assist the local communities to have their say.

Bonds held in public trust from companies to pay for any harmful effects on the environment so BC is not left to carry the costs. This bond should also be used to pay for returning land as close to it's original state once the useful life of the project ends.

The ability to exempt projects from assessment must be removed.

Projects that fail to meet defined legislative sustainability and reconciliation criteria – including majority Indigenous consent, a climate test and respecting ecological limits – must not be approved under a new assessment law.

=====

I respectfully submit my comments regarding proposed projects with potentially great environmental impact. I am in strong support of the updating of current laws to include the following: ensuring more projects are actually reviewed, collaborating with First Nations to lead joint assessments, more input from citizens and independent scientists, rejection of projects that would blow B.C.’s climate targets, and rejection of projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent. These changes are long overdue - they reflect nothing more than a socially, morally and financially responsible, mindful and respectful project review process, which should be commonplace within our government. I truly hope for the sake of all BC residents that the government will see fit to make these important and sensible changes.

=====

There are many initiatives in your proposal for assessment reform that I applaud. I especially encourage you to follow through with implementing UNDRIP, sharing decision making with First Nations and learning from their way of making decisions. I do have a concern about the risk of the consensus process being too quickly abandoned for a more traditional method of dispute resolution by those who are not familiar with or willing to credit the process. It will take skillful leadership and patience to reap the benefits from this "new" approach.

I am also in favour of your move to broadening the assessment scope to include regional and strategic assessment and cumulative effects. I suggest that the scope needs to include the possible effect of a project on climate change. I use the word "possible" with the precautionary principle in mind: If something might be harmful, don't do it. I'd like to see that as a basis for all decisions in the EA.

=====

I think it is important to review all projects with independent scientists or ministry staff assessing appropriateness and not relying merely on the "Professional Reliance" model in order to avoid instances of the failure to include affecting factors when firms have multiple clients with competing interests. Projects that do not comply with B.C.'s climate targets should be rejected. Collaborative consultation with First Nations should be included in affected regions and approval secured from them before any approval granted.

=====

Put teeth in the legislation that hold polluters accountable. It is imperative to identify and recognize the environmental impact of all projects as well as the impact on local communities and First Nations.

=====

I am pleased to see that your government is moving in the right direction in assessing industrial projects in this province. It is a step in the right direction that more projects will undergo an environmental assessment. It is a positive step that First Nations will be consulted and truly have some power in approving or rejecting projects. It is also gratifying to see that projects that will undermine our climate targets will be rejected outright. For too long industry has been green lighted without much thought to environmental impacts with devastating results. We must become better stewards of our resources and our environment. We must honour and respect the rights of Indigenous people's. In addition, industry needs to pay for the costs of clean up if damage is done. Money needs to be collected from industry for remediation when projects wind down. It needs to be factored in as the cost of doing business. Our province is riddled with the toxic dump sites of past industrial development. That should no longer be acceptable.

=====

In BC we need a definite improvement in environmental assessment laws so that these assessments do not allow projects to go ahead unless indigenous rights have been addressed, and the assessments must be based on independent studies.

=====

I understand environmental assessment regulations are under review. I think our new laws should ensure that more projects are actually reviewed and that we:

- Collaborate with First Nations to lead joint assessments
- Get more input from citizens and independent scientists
- Reject projects that would blow B.C.'s climate targets
- Reject projects that fail to secure Indigenous consent

=====

I fully support an environmental review process that puts at its centre independent scientific assessment and meaningful consultation with the relevant First Nations groups. We should not sacrifice future well being on the altar of short-term profits or "prosperity".

=====

My main concern about the Discussion Paper is that it does not allow or require independent evidence and oversight of assessments. I understand that the current approach allows the proponent to generate virtually all the evidence, which is reviewed by an informal technical advisory group.

A new assessment law must ensure a mandatory role for assessments by experts independent of provincial regulators and the proponent, as well as rigorous peer review of scientific and technical information. It must also provide for Indigenous-led studies, and provide mechanisms to enable public participants to engage experts and test evidence, including early engagement requirements to ensure public participants proactively shape how this occurs.

=====

Please rewrite BC's environmental reviews to ensure that all projects are thoroughly reviewed. Projects need to be assessed by independent scientists with more input from First Nations and citizens. These laws must require corporations have clear and feasible plans to clean up toxic spills. Plus sufficient money should be withheld from corporations guaranteeing that they will pay for the clean-up.

We also need our laws to reject projects that would make us unable to attain our climate change targets.

=====

I would like to see assessments that are done in collaboration with First Nations.

Also there should be involvement and input from independent scientists.

It is very important to make sure that there is opportunity for input from all B.C. citizens

Strict adherence to BC's climate targets should be considered in any review process.

=====

It's time to bring proper processes and real reviews back to BC projects that may have environmental impacts.

This is not just consultation, but real science based reviews.

We will no longer tolerate decisions being made behind closed doors after sham public consultations are undertaken.

Collaboration with First Nations is here to stay, it is needed and it must be part of the review process.

If a project negatively impacts climate targets, the environment in which it would be performed, or without Indigenous consent - it's does not proceed.

If the public doesn't want the project even if it passes an environmental review - it doesn't proceed.

If you don't listen to the above suggestions - we'll make sure it doesn't proceed!!

Listen, the Internet makes information move fast and gives individuals a loud voice. You can't hide wrongdoing with the ease of the past anymore. People are angry and they are watching EVERYTHING. It's time to clean up your act.

=====

We (the citizens of Canada and particularly British Columbia) have the right to environmental reviews prior to any approval of the smallest project not to mention large projects which could devastate the clean drinking water etc. There needs to be severe penalties and fines in place for environmental damages due to industrial industries including, mining, fracking, lumber, gas, oil etc. Can you say accountability?

Our Canadian government is failing to uphold any promises to the Climate Accord held in Paris. Our PM is a dirty liar who should be pulled from his seat.

=====

As the Canada Research Chair in Preventive Medicine and Population Health, I would strongly encourage our government to provide project reviews based on independent science -- anything else is a tremendous disservice to your constituents.

=====

I would like to see less rubber-stamping of projects and more projects that are actually reviewed by citizens and independent scientists.

I would like to see more collaborating with First Nations and hearing what their issues are with projects, I would like to see First Nations buy into projects. I would also like to see that you reject projects that do not get First Nations consent.

However, the main thing I want to see is that any projects that, no matter how far downstream, emissions are made, are rejected due to climate change concerns. For instance, if LNG is to be shipped offshore and burned in Malaysia, those projects be rejected because we all share the air and oceans of this small blue planet.

=====

I would like to see the consent of Indigenous peoples actually being taken seriously. If the consent is not obtained, then the project does not go through. End of story.

=====

Thank you for updating the environmental review process for BC. I am very pleased to see positive commitments to implement UNDRIP and the TRC recommendations, as well as the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous nations in decision-making processes. Early engagement, meaningful public participation and regional assessments are also important aspects of an update to BC's current EA process, and a welcome change.

I have three primary concerns with Environmental Assessment.:

1. BC must do it's own assessments on all projects. The size of the project should not dictate whether an assessment is done and passing on the responsibility for an assessment to the Federal Government is not acceptable.,

2 Enforcement. & cleanup. The Mount Polley tailings pond breach was a disaster. The fuel spill in Lemon Cream and the contamination of the Slocan River was shockingly close to home and something that should never have happened. In both cases the BC government should have immediately taken charge of the situation and worked towards cleanup and mitigation the same way that it fights forest fires. Get the job done first then determine later who is responsible to pay for the work. In both cases the provincial response was completely inadequate. And in both cases nobody has been held responsible. That should never be allowed to happen again.

3 While each project assessed needs to be examined in detail, it should also be examined on a regional and provincial impacts basis. Maybe one mine in an area could be allowed but should three? A run of the river generating station may not have too great an impact on a particular location but maybe the access roads, penstock & transmission lines from that project and the other one in the area will have too great an impact on the environment.

As well, there are some key areas where BC must go further if it hopes to meet its goal of restoring public trust in EA.

BC's new EA process must:

- Ensure climate targets are met: a project cannot impair BC's ability to meet its legislated greenhouse gas reduction targets and must be sustainable (cannot exceed ecological limits)
- Require more meaningful public participation and participant funding: multiple opportunities for input and ways to participate, early consultation with public, accessible language and information, creating meaningful opportunities for local expertise
- Ensure independent evidence and oversight of assessments in scientific information collected including the recognition of Indigenous knowledge, replacing professional reliance with independent and peer-reviewed studies, and allowing public participants to engage experts and test evidence
- Address cumulative effects within a region through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments, and
- Reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous consent

=====

I want to thank you and our current provincial government for its commitment to reform environmental assessment, a long overdue and critical endeavour for our province. As a retired scientist now devoting my energy to support groups that aim to sustain life on our planet, I realize how little time we have to make decisions that will protect our local and global environments into the future. It comes down to more effective planning and new laws that take into account cumulative environmental effects and the rights of multiple stakeholders to participate in decision-making, particularly the indigenous nations. BC must provide rigorous and transparent project monitoring and enforcement that is at arm's length from industry. To meet BC's climate targets, new projects must indicate how this will be accomplished because it is clear that some projects now under consideration will make meeting those targets virtually impossible. I understand that BC has one of the weakest environmental assessment processes in North America. Surely beautiful BC must do better!

=====

I join with the large numbers of British Columbians who believe that BC's environmental assessments need a major overhaul. I believe that the current processes and law are failing British Columbians and the lands and waters we rely on. Environmental assessments in BC currently have many problems but the most problematic element is that proponents control the science and evidence brought forward. Public participation is usually relegated to Open Houses with one-sided information paid for and provided by the proponents with the primary aim of downplaying any environmental impacts in order to sell their proposals. Further, little is done to force proponents to address cumulative effects of multiple projects or of future growth expected within the proponent's own proposals. Worse still, the rights of Indigenous British Columbians are often treated glibly and their involvement in the decision making process is not as endemic as it should be.

Your efforts to improve the process are strong steps towards better environmental assessments. You have proposed some strong steps to improve on the status quo, including regional assessments taking a bigger picture view of development, early and improved engagement with communities, and honouring the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

But more needs to be done for British Columbia to have fair and effective rules for environmental assessments. In order to ensure a robust law in BC, we need to:

- ~ ensure that evidence and oversight of assessments are independent of the proponent
- ~ require more meaningful public participation and participant funding
- ~ address cumulative effects within a region, through more project assessments and mandatory regional assessments
- ~ reject projects if they don't meet important legal criteria, including a climate test and Indigenous involvement and consent

This is a once-in-a-generation chance to improve the rules around projects in BC. Take the strong steps we need to protect our air, lands and waters for every British Columbian.