

**From:** Panel Registry

**From:** Myles, Debra [CEAA]  
**Sent:** July 3, 2014 8:30 PM  
**To:** 'Ng, Polly'  
**Cc:** Lee, Paul; Paul Cordeiro; Richard Welfing; Rick Bomhof  
**Subject:** RE: RBT2: Follow Up Questions

Polly

Thank you for the questions – answers are below. As always, it was nice to see you as well.

- Your question on transportation related costs, local government finances and labour market should be directed to the proponent. Please note in the determination of the likelihood that the project will cause significant adverse environmental effects, the federal environmental assessment will consider certain potential socioeconomic effects - but only if these effects come from a change in the biophysical environment. These are called indirect socioeconomic effects.

Direct socioeconomic effects (those that are not a result of a biophysical change to the environment) are not used in federal environmental assessment for determining if the project is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects. This would probably include the factors that you have referenced, above – transportation costs, local government finances and labour market. These factors could be reported in a federal environmental assessment for context or used in the analysis/comparison of alternative, for example, but are not considered in making a prediction or decision on the likelihood that the project will cause significant adverse environmental effects.

For illustration, below is a paragraph from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency [Reference Guide: Determining Whether A Project is Likely to Cause Significant Adverse Environmental Effects](#). Please note that this section of the guide which was prepared in 1994, continues to be relevant under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 2012*.

For example, the socio-economic effects of a project may or may not be factors in determining significance and the related matters. If a socio-economic effect (such as job losses) is caused by a change in the environment (such as loss of fish habitat), which is in turn caused by the project, then the socio-economic effect is an environmental effect within the meaning of the Act and must be considered when determining significance and the related matters. If the socio-economic effect is not caused by a change in the environment, however, but by something else related to the project (for example, reallocation of funding as a result of the project), then the socioeconomic effect is not an environmental effect within the meaning of the Act and cannot be considered in the determination of significance and the related matters.

- Our target for releasing the draft Review Panel Terms of Reference is late summer/early fall. Be assured that if the document is released for comment in August, the comment period will extend into September to allow submissions to be received from those who may be on holidays in the late summer.
- Intervenor status is a qualifier awarded in some quasi-judicial processes (such as that of the National Energy Board) but is not relevant to CEAA only environmental assessments. You do not need any special status to participate in the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 panel review. One exception to this is that the Review Panel is to hold hearings in a manner that offers any interested party an opportunity to participate. As defined in the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act 2012*, an interested party is a person that the Panel determines is directly affected by the carrying out of the project or has relevant information or expertise. If the future Panel decides that it wants participants to submit information regarding, or to apply to be an interested party, it will release a communication in that regard.

Debra

*Debra Myles*

Panel Manager | Gestionnaire de commission

Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency | Agence canadienne d'évaluation environnementale

160 Elgin Street, 22nd floor, Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3 | 160 rue Elgin, 22e étage, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H3

Telephone | Téléphone 613-957-0626

[debra.myles@ceaa-acee.gc.ca](mailto:debra.myles@ceaa-acee.gc.ca)

---

**From:** Ng, Polly

**Sent:** June 23, 2014 4:47 PM

**To:** Myles, Debra [CEAA]

**Cc:** Lee, Paul; Paul Cordeiro; Richard Welfing; Rick Bomhof

**Subject:** RBT2: Follow Up Questions

Hello Debra,

It was nice to see you last week at the Technical Working Group meeting. I have a few follow up questions:

- How come transportation related costs are not examined as part of the local government finances valued component? I was surprised to see that the scope of assessment for some VCs such as the labour market is so broad, so just wondering if the local government finances VC could be similarly broadened.
- When do you anticipate the Panel Terms of Reference will be ready for consultation? Last we spoke, you mentioned that you were hoping that they would be completed in spring or early fall, so just wanted to see if the timeline is firmer.
- How would we apply for intervenor status for the panel assessment? We met with several Port Metro Vancouver staff today and they mentioned that Delta had applied but were not sure if Surrey, Langley City, and Langley Township had applied.

Thanks! Polly

POLLY NG | TRANSPORTATION PLANNER



Rapid Transit and Strategic Projects

13450 - 104 Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

P: 604-591-4027 | [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**Please consider the environment before printing this email**