Date : 3/15/2012 7:25:44 PM
From : "Howard, Jacquelyn"
To : "Maclean, Heather" , "O'Neill, Melony" , "Power, Glenda"
Cc : "Brown, Milly" , "Cheeseman, Josephine" , "Collingwood, Jennifer"
Subject : Fw: Government dismisses Joint Review Panel recommendations
Attachment : Government dismisses Joint Review Panel recommendations.doc;Scope of EA.PDF;image001.jpg;

Communications
Executive Council
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
P.O.Box 8700
St.John's, NL
Canada
A1B 4J6

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: oppositionnewsreleas
To: Miles, Peter
Sent: Thu Mar 15 18:31:38 2012
Subject: Government dismisses Joint Review Panel recommendations

NEWS RELEASE

Office of the Official Opposition

March 15, 2012
For Immediate Release

Government dismisses Joint Review Panel recommendations

Liberal Opposition Leader Dwight Ball today stated that it's disappointing that the provincial government dismissed recommendations 4.1 and 4.2 of the Joint Review Panel of the Lower Churchill Generation Project.

"This panel was established by the Federal and Provincial governments in 2009 and looked at all aspects of the proposed Lower Churchill Generation Project," said Ball. "After two years of study and several months of public consultations, the panel concluded that Nalcor had not demonstrated the justification of the Project as a whole in energy and economic terms."

Ball noted that the panel recommended an independent review of all alternatives be conducted, but government dismissed that recommendation.

"It is astonishing, but not surprising, that government dismissed this recommendation," said Ball. "In the House of Assembly, we've asked for new information from the government on Muskrat Falls, but have been refused every time. We've asked for government to table studies on natural gas, five year cash flow projections from Nalcor and the power purchase agreement between Nalcor and

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. For a project of this size, this information should be easy to provide but government has refused."

Ball also stated that it's disappointing that the Minister of Natural Resources, Jerome Kennedy, stated today that the Joint Review Panel ventured into an area they shouldn't have when they made recommendations on the economics of the proposed project and for further study of the alternatives.

"I'd like to remind the Minister that the need, purpose, rational, socio-economics and alternatives to the project are key areas within the scope of the environmental assessment," said Ball. "For Minister Kennedy to state that they were outside their area of expertise shows his lack of understanding of the mandate of the Joint Review Panel."

-30-

Attachment: Part II – Scope of the Environmental Assessment, Joint Review Panel Federal/Provincial Agreement.
http://www.env.gov.nl.ca/env/env_assessment/projects/Y2010/1305/final_jrp_agreement.pdf

Media Contact: Peter Miles| Director of Communications| Office of the Official Opposition| 729-6151| 725-5332| E copies @ www.liberaloppositionnl.com

Office of the Official Opposition

NEWS RELEASE

March 15, 2012
For Immediate Release

Government dismisses Joint Review Panel recommendations

Liberal Opposition Leader Dwight Ball today stated that it's disappointing that the provincial government dismissed recommendations 4.1 and 4.2 of the Joint Review Panel of the Lower Churchill Generation Project.

"This panel was established by the Federal and Provincial governments in 2009 and looked at all aspects of the proposed Lower Churchill Generation Project," said Ball. "After two years of study and several months of public consultations, the panel concluded that Nalcor had not demonstrated the justification of the Project as a whole in energy and economic terms."

Ball noted that the panel recommended an independent review of all alternatives be conducted, but government dismissed that recommendation.

"It is astonishing, but not surprising, that government dismissed this recommendation," said Ball. "In the House of Assembly, we've asked for new information from the government on Muskrat Falls, but have been refused every time. We've asked for government to table studies on natural gas, five year cash flow projections from Nalcor and the power purchase agreement between Nalcor and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. For a project of this size, this information should be easy to provide but government has refused."

Ball also stated that it's disappointing that the Minister of Natural Resources, Jerome Kennedy, stated today that the Joint Review Panel ventured into an area they shouldn't have when they made recommendations on the economics of the proposed project and for further study of the alternatives.

"I'd like to remind the Minister that the need, purpose, rational, socio-economics and alternatives to the project are key areas within the scope of the environmental assessment," said Ball. "For Minister Kennedy to state that they were outside their area of expertise shows his lack of understanding of the mandate of the Joint Review Panel."

-30-

Attachment: Part II – Scope of the Environmental Assessment, Joint Review Panel Federal/Provincial Agreement.
http://www.env.gov.nl.ca/env/env_assessment/projects/Y2010/1305/final_jrp_agreement.pdf

Media Contact: Peter Miles| Director of Communications| Office of the Official Opposition| 729-6151| 725-5332| E copies @ www.liberaloppositionnl.com

Part II – Scope of the Environmental Assessment

The Panel shall consider the following factors in the EA of the Project/Undertaking as outlined in Sections 16(1) and 16(2) of the CEAA and Sections 57 and 69 of the EPA:

1. Purpose of the Project/Undertaking;
2. Need for the Project/Undertaking;
3. Rationale for the Project/Undertaking;
4. Alternative means of carrying out the Project/Undertaking that are technically and economically feasible and the environmental effects of any such alternative means;
5. Alternatives to the Project/Undertaking;
6. Extent to which biological diversity is affected by the Project/Undertaking;
7. Description of the present environment which may reasonably be expected to be affected, directly or indirectly, by the Project/Undertaking, including adequate baseline characterisation;
8. Description of the likely future condition of the environment within the expected life span of the Project/Undertaking if the Project/Undertaking was not approved;
9. Environmental Effects of the Project/Undertaking, including the Environmental Effects of malfunctions, accidents or unplanned events that may occur in connection with the Project/Undertaking;
10. Any cumulative Environmental Effects that are likely to result from the Project/Undertaking in combination with other projects or activities that have been or will be carried out;
11. The significance of the Environmental Effects as described in items 9 and 10;
12. Mitigation measures that are technically and economically feasible and that would mitigate any significant adverse Environmental Effects of the Project/Undertaking, including the interaction of these measures with existing management plans;
13. Proposals for environmental compliance monitoring;
14. Measures to enhance any beneficial Environmental Effects;
15. Need for and requirements of any follow-up program in respect of the Project/Undertaking;
16. Capacity of renewable resources that are likely to be significantly affected by the Project/Undertaking to meet the needs of the present and those of the future;
17. Extent of application of the precautionary principle to the Project/Undertaking; and
18. Comments received from Aboriginal persons or groups, the public and interested parties by the Panel during the EA;
19. Factors related to climate change including greenhouse gas emissions;
20. Proposed public information program.

To assist in the analysis and consideration of these issues, in addition to the Secretariat established by Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador to support the Panel, the Panel may retain, within its approved budget, independent expertise to provide information on and help interpret technical and scientific issues and matters related to traditional knowledge and community knowledge.

<u>Aboriginal Rights Considerations</u>

The Panel will have the mandate to invite information from Aboriginal persons or groups related to the nature and scope of potential or established Aboriginal rights or title in the area of the Project, as well as information on the potential adverse impacts or potential infringement that the Project/Undertaking will have on asserted or established Aboriginal rights or title.