MCINNES COOPER

J. Alex Templeton
Direct +1 (709) 570 7344
alex.templeton@mcinnescooper.com

5th Floor
10 Fort William Place
PO Box 5939
St. John's NL
Canada A1C 5X4
Tel +1 (709) 722 8735 | Fax +1 (709) 722 1763

Our File: 168555

October 25, 2018

VIA E-MAIL & COURIER

Honourable Dwight Ball
Premier, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
East Block, Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NL A1B 4J6

Honourable Andrew Parsons
Minister, Municipal Affairs and Environment
West Block, Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NL A1B 4J6

Dear Sirs:

Re: Placentia Bay Atlantic Salmon Aquaculture Project, Registration 1834 – Section 107 *Environmental Protection Act* Appeal by Atlantic Salmon Federation (Canada) (ASF)

We write on behalf of our client, Atlantic Salmon Federation (Canada) for the purpose of filing, pursuant to subsection 107(1) of the *Environmental Protection Act*, the enclosed appeal of Minister Parsons' decision regarding the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) relating to the captioned project. The appeal contests Minister Parsons' decision that the EIS is compliant with the *Act*, the *Environmental Assessment Regulations* and the EIS guidelines issued to the proponent.

The mandate letter issued by Premier Ball to Minister Parsons' predecessor dated November 15, 2017 speaks of the *The Way Forward* plan for sustainability and growth, focused on *inter alia* strengthening the economy and creating private sector jobs. However, the letter also speaks explicitly about using evidence and research to inform decisions. This echoes frequent statements by the Ball Government committing to evidence and science-based decision making.

Take for example Premier Ball's statement of July 31, 2018 to the National Advisory Panel on Marine Protected Areas Standards, wherein he reiterated that his Government is *"committed to collaborating with the Federal Government to achieve its marine conservation targets, with decisions based on good science to advance the goal of marine conservation and long-term economic benefit for our residents".* Likewise, take the Ball Government's election platform titled *A Stronger Tomorrow: Our Five Point Plan*, which explicitly states, *"Liberals believe in making*

evidence-based choices when it comes to development decisions that affect our environment. We also believe in a cautionary approach. This means taking measures to protect against the possibility of environmental damage."

Without question, rationalizing economic activity with environmental imperatives can be challenging. Luckily, the Legislature wisely enacted the *Environmental Protection Act* as a means of structuring environmental assessment, to assist decision-makers' consideration of the countervailing interests that arise from projects that risk negatively affecting the environment. The importance of closely following the *Act* is aptly addressed by our Court of Appeal in *Labrador Inuit Association v. Newfoundland (Minister of Environment & Labour)* (1997), 155 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 93, where it states:

> *"If the rights of future generations to the protection of the present integrity of the natural world are to be taken seriously, and not to be regarded as mere empty rhetoric, care must be taken in the interpretation and application of the legislation. Environmental laws must be construed against their commitment to future generations and against a recognition that, in addressing environmental issues, we often have imperfect knowledge as to the potential impact of activities on the environment. One must also be alert to the fact that governments themselves, even strongly pro-environment ones, are subject to many countervailing social and economic forces, sometimes legitimate and sometimes not. Their agendas are often influenced by non-environmental considerations.*
>
> *The legislation, if it is to do its job, must therefore be applied in a manner that will counteract the ability of immediate collective economic and social forces to set their own environmental agendas. It must be regarded as something more than a mere statement of lofty intent. It must be a blueprint for protective action."*

By the *Act*'s design, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment is the sentry who protects environmental stewardship from being cast aside by the magnitude of social and economic benefits promised by development. In this respect, the Minister's post may be lonely and unenviable, but it is a critical one. It is the Minister's responsibility to ensure the *Environmental Protection Act*'s blueprint for protective action is followed, so that full consideration is given to the appropriate cost-benefit balance of the project.

In the case of the captioned project, the social and economic interests that favour the project advancing immediately are significant. However, as the within appeal attests, the EIS accepted herein is gravely deficient.

By initially accepting a non-compliant EIS, Minister Parsons signaled that the environmental consequences associated with the project are sufficiently known for the purpose of deciding the project should advance, and deciding appropriate mitigation and monitoring of the risks. However, as the within appeal details, the EIS requirements that the proponent obtain *inter alia* additional data to determine the potential for significant effects and to provide the necessary baseline information for monitoring programs, and to complete the description of the environment by conducting original surveys and research, have plainly not been met. In such circumstances, how can the appropriate cost-benefit balance of the project be decided?

What if such original surveys and research showed the wild Atlantic salmon stocks in Placentia Bay to be endangered, which is to say at immediate risk of extinction? Would the conditions attached to the release be different than they are now? Would the project be released at all?

Are you in a position to make such decisions without this data, and if so, why were they required by the EIS Guidelines in the first place?

Is this the manner of evidence and science-based decision making that the Ball Government intended to commit itself in its election platform? ASF submits that it is not.

This appeal is asking that Minister Parsons do the right thing.

Section 107 of the *Act* provides for the within appeal. In providing for such an appeal, the Legislature clearly recognized that ministerial decisions regarding the sufficiency of EISs and the release of projects from further environmental assessment are susceptible to error. This is exactly why there are section 107 appeal rights so that such decisions can be reflected upon and where appropriate be reversed. This is precisely one of those appeal granting occasions.

The ASF duly asks Minister Parsons to seize upon the opportunity presented by the within section 107 appeal to revisit the EIS and require the proponent to undertake further work, remedy its omissions and return with a compliant EIS. This is the right way forward.

Should you have any questions about the appeal, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

J. Alex Templeton

JAT/ah
Encl.

Atlantic Salmon Federation  Fédération du Saumon Atlantique

October 25, 2018

Andrew Parsons, Minister
Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment
West Block, Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, NL A1B 4J6

Dear Minister Parsons:

Pursuant to s.107 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA), we write to appeal your decision to accept the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Placentia Bay Atlantic Salmon Aquaculture Project (reg. 1834) as compliant under s.60(1)(b) of the Act.

We are appealing on the grounds that the decision to accept the EIS and recommend release of the project is contrary to the principles, purpose, and requirements of the EPA (i.e., the EIS is non-compliant), and is therefore an unreasonable decision that could not be made by the minister pursuant to the EPA. In support of that conclusion we make three points:

1) The EIS is patently deficient with respect to the requirements outlined in the EPA and the EIS guidelines;

2) The minister does not have the discretion to accept a deficient EIS; and

3) The minister does not have the discretion to recommend release of a project when an EIS has been determined to be deficient.

We outline these grounds of appeal below:

1. The EIS is patently deficient.

On June 22, 2018, ASF submitted substantial comments to the EA Division regarding the deficiencies in the information provided by the proponent with specific reference to wild Atlantic salmon (see attached). Our submission focused on four key areas of concern:

1) Lack of original data collection to augment the information presented in the project registration document;

2) Evaluation of potential impacts is not rigorous, reasonable, balanced, or transparent, resulting in conclusions that are not justified;

PO Box 5200 St. Andrews, NB Canada E5B 3S8
Tel: 1 800 565 5666/506 529 4581 | savesalmon@asf.ca
www.asf.ca

3) Lack of meaningful detail about the proponent's approach to follow-up monitoring programs; and

4) Superficial evaluation of project alternatives with unjustified conclusions.

Within each of those broad areas we identified numerous instances where the information provided by the proponent did not meet the EIS guidelines. Our overall conclusion was that the EIS does not sufficiently (and in some cases, not at all) address the issues which formed the basis on which it was ordered, nor does it meet the minimum standard for acceptance as specified in the guidelines issued to the proponent.

Likewise, the Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) conducted a thorough review of sections of the EIS pertaining to wild Atlantic salmon and other fish and fish habitat (http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/ScR-RS/2018/2018_045-eng.pdf). The review contained 26 pages of comments, concerns, and deficiencies, many of which support the concerns expressed by ASF. DFO concluded that:

> *"the EIS is lacking in the sections dealing specifically with impacts on the local and broader environment. Additionally, the conclusions made throughout the document are not consistently supported by existing information. DFO Science's assessment of the risks associated with the proposed project identified a long list of significant uncertainties. Despite significant and numerous knowledge gaps, the report* [EIS] *consistently states that there is medium to high certainty of non-significant impacts. This is highly unlikely"* (p. 2).

Some of the deficiencies identified by ASF and DFO may be open to interpretation with regards to the extent that they preclude the EIS from complying with the EPA and the guidelines. However, the situation is unequivocal when required information is missing entirely from the EIS. In **Table 1** we present numerous specific examples related to wild Atlantic salmon where key information required by the Act and/or guidelines is demonstrably absent from the EIS including:

1) Baseline data necessary for impact assessment and monitoring was not collected;

2) Analysis is not focused on wild salmon in Placentia Bay;

3) Data on specific aspects of Placentia Bay salmon biology and ecology are missing;

4) Discussion of genetic and ecological interactions of wild and farmed salmon in Placentia Bay is missing;

5) Literature review of disease and parasite impacts is missing;

6) Discussion of proximity of sea cage sites to wild salmon rivers and impacts on migrating wild salmon is missing;

7) Predicted future condition of the environment is missing; and

8) Description of monitoring programs for the impacts of disease and parasites is missing.

In the above instances, it can be easily and clearly demonstrated that the information was required by either the EPA or the guidelines but has not been included in the EIS or component studies. How can the EIS can be deemed to comply with the Act and guidelines when key information mandated by the Act and/or guidelines is obviously absent?

While ASF is concerned about all of the identified deficiencies, we are particularly troubled by the proponent's failure to collect the necessary baseline data on wild Atlantic salmon in Placentia Bay and by its failure to describe monitoring programs for the harmful impacts of ecological interactions and the transmission of diseases and parasites on wild salmon.

Conducting field research to collect original data is a clear requirement of the EIS when existing data are not sufficient to adequately predict the effects of the undertaking or to design appropriate monitoring programs, which is clearly the case here. Both DFO and the EA Division have acknowledged that existing data on wild salmon in Placentia Bay are not sufficient for the purposes of the environmental assessment. Moreover, the proponent itself acknowledged lack of existing data on wild salmon as a key data gap impairing their ability to predict impacts and design monitoring programs. Lack of appropriate data erodes the entire foundation of the EIS, and it similarly caused DFO to conclude that the "*the conclusions made throughout the document are not consistently supported by existing information*" and that the "*level of certainty in the conclusions on risk characterization is insufficient and requires additional information and/or sampling.*" ASF agrees with these conclusions.

Likewise, the design of follow up monitoring programs to ensure mitigation strategies are working and to understand residual impacts is fundamental to a solid environmental assessment. Both the EPA and the guidelines require the proponent to describe in detail follow-up monitoring programs for <u>all</u> harmful effects and their associated mitigation measures. DFO, the EA Division, members of the public, and the proponent have all identified ecological interactions between wild and farmed salmon and the spread of parasites and diseases from farmed to wild salmon as key issues of concern. In response, the proponent has proposed numerous mitigation measures to deal with these issues. Consequently, the EPA and guidelines require the EIS to contain details of a proposed program of study to monitor these impacts and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures. However, this information is completely absent from the EIS and component studies, and there is no evidence that the proponent intends to design and implement follow-up monitoring programs for these key impacts.

2. The minister does not have the discretion to accept a deficient EIS.

Given the evidence presented above and in **Table 1**, the relevant question becomes: Does the minister have the discretion to accept an EIS in which information required by the EPA and/or EIS guidelines is absent (i.e., a non-compliant EIS)?

To answer this question, we must turn to the EPA and determine whether it can be interpreted in such a way to permit the minister to reasonably make such a decision. In other words, we are concerned with "whether the decision falls within a range of possible, acceptable outcomes which are defensible in respect of the facts and the law" (Dunsmuir v. New Brunswick, 2008 SCC9).

For this analysis, the relevant legislation is s.60 (1) (b) of the EPA which states:

> 60. (1) Upon receiving the environmental impact statement submitted under section 55, the minister shall:
>
> (b) examine the statement and determine whether or not it complies with this Part and the guidelines.

The conclusion that the minister's decision to accept the EIS falls under this section is verified by the language used in the Environmental Assessment Bulletin announcing the decision (Sept 6, 2018) which states that "the minister has determined that this document complies with Part X of the Environmental Protection Act (the Act) and the EIS guidelines." Similar language is used in the minister's letter to the proponent dated Aug 28, 2016.

The wording of s.60 is important here. It does not say that the minister must decide whether the EIS is "good enough", but rather that the minister must "examine" the EIS and "determine" its "compliance" with the Act and guidelines. These words, read according to their plain and ordinary meaning are clear and unambiguous. The Oxford dictionary provides the following definitions:

> **Examine:** Inspect (someone or something) thoroughly in order to determine their nature or condition.
>
> **Determine:** Ascertain or establish exactly by research or calculation.
>
> **Compliance:** The state or fact of according with or meeting rules or standards.

In other words, the minister must thoroughly inspect the EIS to establish, using a high standard, whether it meets the specific requirements set out by the EPA and guidelines.

It is also important to note the language used in the EPA and EIS guidelines. In most cases, the direction is given in the form of specific instructions to the proponent using the word "shall" (e.g., the EIS shall include/provide/describe etc.). It is clear that the required information is not optional – the proponent is directed to provide it. Failure to do so therefore results in non-compliance.

As described above and in **Table 1**, even a cursory examination of the EIS reveals numerous instances where the required information is absent. A more thorough analysis such as those conducted by DFO and ASF reveals many more instances where the information provided is incomplete or inadequate for meeting the objectives of the environmental assessment.

Given these facts and the specific and unambiguous language used in s.60(1)(b), it is clear that the minister was not authorized to accept the EIS. A determination made in good faith and based on a thorough comparison of the EIS against the requirements set out in the EPA and guidelines can only lead to one conclusion: declare the EIS deficient and require the proponent to amend or revise it as per s.61 of the EPA. When the evidence demonstrates that some requirements have not been met, the minister

cannot arbitrarily avoid ordering the proponent to conduct further work by simply concluding that the EIS is not deficient.

The minister's decision to accept the EIS was therefore unreasonable because he chose an option that, given the facts and the law, was not available to him.

3. The minister does not have the discretion to recommend release of a project when an EIS has been determined to be deficient.

ASF notes that the language used in s.67(1) differs from that used in s.60(1)(b) in that it refers to the minister's "opinion" rather than "determination":

> 67. (1) Where a public hearing has not been ordered under subsection 63(1) and, in the opinion of the minister, an environmental impact statement has been completed and complies with this Part and the guidelines, the minister shall recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that the undertaking
>
> (a) be released subject to terms and conditions; or
>
> (b) not be permitted to proceed.

It would be erroneous for the minister to interpret this language as conferring upon him the authority to determine an EIS' compliance as a matter of discretionary "opinion" (i.e., different from his "determination" under s.60(1)(b)). Such an interpretation, and any decision to recommend release on that interpretation, would be unreasonable.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Supreme Court and Court of Appeal have described and repeatedly reaffirmed the proper approach to statutory interpretation as follows:

> *"As in the case with any statutory provision, its meaning and effect must be gathered by construing the words used in the context of the statute as a whole and harmoniously with the scheme and purpose of the legislation. In giving meaning to the words used in an enactment, the Court must recognize that the inherent plasticity of language requires reference to context and inferred purpose to give them specific meaning. Section 16 of the Interpretation Act requires that every provision of an Act shall be considered remedial and be given 'the liberal construction and interpretation that best ensures the attainment of the objects of the act... according to its true meaning'"* [emphasis added] (R v. Pardy, 2014 NLCA 357)
>
> *"s.16 enunciates a principle of harmonization in which the courts are directed, in cases of dispute, to adopt and apply an interpretation that fairly reconciles the language used in the enactment with the broader objectives of the legislation so as to achieve the general goal, or to rectify the mischief, to which the legislative act appears to be directed."* [emphasis added] (Archean Resources Ltd. V. Newfoundland (Minister of Justice), 2002 NFCA 43).

In other words, the EPA must be interpreted not only on the basis of the words which are used, but also in a way that is consistent with its overriding goal of protecting the environment and quality of life of the people of the province.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Supreme Court and Court of Appeal both commented extensively on the interpretation issue during the judicial review of the minister's decision to release the Placentia Bay project without requiring an EIS. In overturning the minister's decision, the courts have consistently found that a narrow interpretation of the EPA, which allows the minister to make a decision inconsistent with the broader aims and objectives of the EPA, is unreasonable. More specifically, the courts have concluded that the minister does not have the jurisdiction to avoid ordering an EIS when the legislated conditions are met because to do so would run counter to the purpose and spirit of the legislation.

Within that context, it becomes apparent that any interpretation of the EPA that allows the minister to recommend release of a project when an EIS has been, as a matter of fact, determined to be deficient is unreasonable.

Why would the legislation place significant limits on ministerial discretion in terms of deciding when an EIS is required, and provide specific instructions as to what is required to be in an EIS (EPA s.57), only to then confer on the minister the discretion to ignore obvious and significant deficiencies and allow the project to proceed? Such an approach would not be consistent with the scheme and purpose of the legislation.

Based on a proper and principled interpretation of the legislation, it is clear that the use of the term "opinion" in s.67 is not meant to confer ministerial discretion to ignore the determination made under s.60. Rather, the minister's opinion must be based on, and consistent with, that determination.

Conclusion

ASF has demonstrated, unequivocally, that the EIS submitted by Grieg does not comply with Part X of the EPA or with the specific guidelines issued to the proponent by the EA Division. We have also demonstrated that, in light of this fact, the minister has no reasonable option under the EPA but to declare the EIS deficient and order the proponent to undertake remedial action under s.61. ASF herby requests that this appeal be allowed, that the decision to accept the EIS as compliant with the EPA and guidelines be overturned, and an order for remedial action pursuant to s.61 of the EPA be made to the proponent.

Sincerely,

Dr. Stephen Sutton

Table 1. Specific instances related to wild Atlantic salmon where information required by the EPA and/or guidelines is absent from the EIS.

Requirement		Status in the EIS
Collection of necessary data The EIS guidelines shall include a requirement to outline the design of studies necessary to provide additional information for the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EA Regs 8(1)(c)). The rationale for a component study is based on the need to obtain additional data to determine the potential for significant effects and to provide the necessary baseline information for monitoring programs (guidelines p. 22). Using qualitative and/or quantitative surveys, the EIS shall include a description of the existing biophysical and socio-economic environment that will be affected or might reasonably be expected to be affected by the undertaking. If the information available is insufficient or no longer representative, the proponent shall complete the description of the environment by conducting original surveys and research (guidelines 4.2). The key reason why the EA Division recommended an EIS rather than an Environmental Preview Report after the screening review was "because the information for areas of further study (e.g., baseline wild salmon data and other recommendations in the CSAS report) are not readily available" (Report by Mr. Eric Watton, EA Division, to Minister, July 22, 2016; p. 48). In discussing the Watton Report, the Newfoundland and Labrador Court of Appeal clearly acknowledged that the need for further research to address many uncertainties, knowledge gaps, and recommendations was a key reason for why an EIS was required (Newfoundland and Labrador (Environment and Climate Change) v. Atlantic Salmon Federation (Canada), 2018 NLCA 53: paragraphs 180-187)		Proponent acknowledges "There are a number of data gaps related to the wild Atlantic salmon stocks in Placentia Bay. Key gaps include: (1) data related to the migration routes of wild salmon, both smolts and returning adults, within Placentia Bay; (2) data related to the time spent by and activities of wild salmon within Placentia Bay; and (3) data related to the ecological interaction between wild salmon and escaped farmed salmon." (EIS p. 344). The Wild Salmon Component Study is "a desktop study of information and literature" with no additional information collected or presented that was not available to the proponent at the time of the screening review. The proponent made no effort to conduct original research to collect the data necessary to fill the identified data gaps. **The requirements of the proponent to "obtain additional data to determine the potential for significant effects and to provide the necessary baseline information for monitoring programs" and to "complete the description of the environment by conducting original surveys and research" have not been met** (as per guidelines 4.2).

Table 1. Continued

Requirement		Status in the EIS
Focus on wild salmon in Placentia Bay The component study shall provide a detailed description of the status of wild Atlantic salmon in Placentia Bay (guidelines 4.3.1).		EIS p. 173 – proponent acknowledges that there is "limited information related to wild Atlantic salmon specifically in Placentia Bay". Consequently, the required focus on salmon in Placentia Bay is largely **ABSENT.**
Specific aspects of Placentia Bay salmon biology and ecology The component study shall include a characterization of the current distribution, abundance, genetic population structure, morphology, health and fitness and migratory patterns of wild Atlantic salmon in the waters of Placentia Bay (guidelines 4.3.1(a))		*Current distribution* – locations of salmon rivers flowing into Placentia bay is provided (EIS p. 174). Distribution of wild salmon in the waters of Placentia Bay is **ABSENT.** *Abundance* – an estimate is provided (EIS p. 176) but not backed by any scientific data. *Genetic population structure* – a reference is made to existing data on the genetic population structure of wild Atlantic salmon on the south coast of Newfoundland (EIS p. 175), but no data are provided. Characterization of the genetic population structure of wild salmon in the waters of Placentia Bay is **ABSENT.** *Morphology* – **ABSENT.** *Health and fitness* – **ABSENT.** *Migratory patterns* – **ABSENT.** Proponent acknowledges that there is no existing data on salmon migratory patterns in Placentia Bay (EIS p. 175).
Genetic and ecological interactions in Placentia Bay The component study shall include a discussion of genetic and ecological interactions of farmed salmon escapees on wild Atlantic salmon in Placentia Bay (guidelines 4.3.1(b))		There is a general discussion about genetic and ecological interactions between wild and farmed salmon (WAS component study section 4.2). However, the required discussion of genetic and ecological interactions in Placentia Bay is **ABSENT.**

Table 1. Continued

Requirement		Status in the EIS
Literature review of disease and parasite impacts The component study shall include a literature review of the effects of disease and parasites from farmed salmon on wild Atlantic salmon (guidelines 4.3.1(c)) Preserving the biological fitness of wild Atlantic salmon to be considered in selecting key issues (guidelines 4.1)		There is a brief discussion and reference to the literature acknowledging that sea lice can spread from farmed to wild salmon (WAS component study 4.3.1). There is list of pathogens that are commonly found in farmed salmon (WAS component study 4.3.2). The required literature review of the effects of disease and parasite transfer on wild salmon is **ABSENT.** i.e., no review of the extensive literature demonstrating the significant negative effects of parasite and disease transfer on the biological fitness of wild salmon as per guidelines 4.3.1(c).
Proximity of sea cage sites to wild salmon rivers The component study shall include a discussion of the proximity of the sea cages to scheduled and non-scheduled rivers and the potential effects on migrating wild Atlantic salmon (guidelines 4.3.1 (d).		The distances of proposed sea cage sites to salmon rivers is presented, although some distance are incorrect and some non-scheduled rivers are missing. There is a short discussion which acknowledges that escaped farm salmon may enter salmon rivers (Wild Salmon Component Study 4.4). However, the required discussion of the potential effects on migrating wild Atlantic salmon in Placentia Bay is **ABSENT.**
Predicted future condition of the environment An EIS shall include a description of the predicted future condition of the environment that might reasonably be expected to occur within the expected life span of the undertaking, if the undertaking was not approved (EPA 57 (d. ii)). The EIS shall describe the predicted future condition of the environment with respect to key issues, if the project did not proceed (guidelines 6.1). The predicted future condition of the environment shall include a discussion of Atlantic salmon populations and climate change (guidelines 6.1).		The sections referenced in the EIS Table of Concordance (sections 6.6 and 7.0) **do not contain the required information.** The required description of the predicted future condition of the environment with respect to key issues (e.g., genetic integrity and biological fitness of wild salmon) if the project did not proceed is **ABSENT.** The required discussion of wild Atlantic salmon and climate change is **ABSENT.**

Table 1. Continued

Requirement		Status in the EIS
Description of monitoring programs for all harmful effects and proposed mitigation measures An environmental impact statement shall include a proposed program of study designed to monitor all substances and harmful effects that would be produced by the undertaking (EPA 57(h)). The component study [Wild Atlantic Salmon] shall provide a detailed description of follow-up monitoring that will be conducted to determine the effectiveness of mitigative measures and residual effects (guidelines 4.3.1). The EIS shall describe the environmental monitoring and follow-up programs. The purpose is to verify the accuracy of the predictions made in the assessment of effects as well as the effectiveness of the mitigation measures (guidelines 7.4) The proponent acknowledges that the principal harmful effects of the project on wild salmon are: 1) genetic introgression; 2) ecological interactions; and 3) transfer of pathogens and parasites to wild salmon (Salmon Component Study p. 38). The proponent proposes several mitigation measures to address each of the three principal potential effects they have identified. Those mitigation measures are summarized in EIS Table 8.1 (p. 483). As per the legislation and guidelines cited above, the proponent was therefore required to describe monitoring programs for <u>each</u> of these effects and associated mitigation measures.		*Genetic introgression* – The proponent proposes to develop a genetic monitoring program in collaboration with DFO (EIS 7.8.2), however no further information provided. The details required under guidelines 7.4 (i. to vii) are **ABSENT.** *Ecological interactions* – description of monitoring program and associated mitigation measures is **ABSENT.** *Transfer of pathogens to wild salmon* - description of monitoring program and associated mitigation measures is **ABSENT.** *Transfer of parasites to wild salmon* - description of monitoring program and associated mitigation measures is **ABSENT.**