

WORK PLAN

for the

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

of the

Paramount Resources Ltd.

Cameron Hills Drilling Project

January 15, 2001

Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board

200 Scotia Centre

P.O. Box 938

Yellowknife, NT

X1A 2N7

Phone: (867) 873-9193

Fax: (867) 920-4761

CONTENTS

1	WORK PLAN PURPOSE	3
2	DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION	4
3	REGULATORY ACTIVITY SUMMARY	6
4	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	8
	4.1 REVIEW BOARD	8
	4.2 REVIEW BOARD STAFF	8
	4.3 OTHER PARTIES	8
5	EA WORK PLAN	10
	5.1 MILESTONES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	10
	5.2 EA WORK PLAN SCHEDULE	16
	APPENDIX 1	17

1 WORK PLAN PURPOSE

This *Work Plan* provides a framework for the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (the Review Board) to undertake the environmental assessment (EA) of the *Paramount Resources Ltd. Cameron Hills Drilling Project* (the development). The EA will be conducted in accordance with Part 5 of the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (MVRMA).

This work plan contains:

- a description of the development as provided by the developer (Paramount Resources Ltd.);
- a summary of the regulatory activities to date; and
- an outline of the general approach to completing the EA, including defining the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the EA process.

Attached in Appendix 1 are legal premises and definitions relevant to completing an environmental assessment.

2 DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

The development is located on the plateau of the Cameron Hills in the Northwest Territories, about 75 km southwest of Enterprise, NWT and immediately north of the Alberta/NWT border.

The activities proposed to be undertaken as part of the development include the following;

- Re-use a temporary winter access road, approximately 33 km in length, from Indian Brook, Alberta on Highway 35, to a point approximately 10 km into the NWT. This winter road access will follow the same alignment as the winter road previously permitted and used in the 1999-2000 winter season.
- Air access will be via a temporary winter airstrip equipped with lights and a radio beacon.
- Drill, complete and test 9 new wells. Each well location will be cleared and graded as required to a maximum size of 110 m by 110 m. Access to the well sites will be through existing cut-lines where possible although some new access routes will have to be constructed. The testing will involve the flaring of natural gas.
- Complete and test 7 existing wells. No clearing or grading will be required for the existing well sites with the exception of a turn-around area at the well-head. The testing will involve the flaring of natural gas.
- Construct three ice bridges: two on the Cameron River and one on a tributary of the Cameron River. Other water crossings will be over streams that are expected to freeze to the bottom.
- Construct up to six temporary 20 man camps. The camp locations will take advantage of previous camp or airstrip locations. Water for the camps may come from an existing well or new wells will be drilled at each camp site.
- Obtain drilling water from a specific unnamed lake near the well sites and, if required, from the water wells.
- Dispose of drill wastes in two remote sumps. Some clearing and leveling will be required around the sumps.
- Use an existing borrow pit. Soil excavated from the borrow pit will be used during the closure of the drilling fluid and sewage sumps using the mix, bury and cover method.

The following outlines, in very general terms, the step-by-step process and schedule proposed by the developer in their environmental screening report for the Cameron Hills Drilling Project. This outline does not highlight the consultation and regulatory process.

Table 1 – Paramount Resources Cameron Hills Drilling Project Schedule

Development Item	Start Date	Number of Days Required	End Date
Survey Locations	July 3, 2000	2	July 4, 2000
Access Preparation	Nov. 15, 2000	15	Nov. 30, 2000
Prepare Leases	Dec. 1, 2000	14	Dec. 10, 2000
Prepare and Set Up Camps	Dec. 1, 2000	6	Dec. 5, 2000
Move Three Drill Rigs In	Dec. 10, 2000	2	Dec. 12, 2000
Drill Wells	Dec. 12, 2000	90	Mar. 10, 2001
Move Service Rigs In	Dec. 21, 2000	74	Mar. 3, 2001
Complete and Evaluate	Dec. 28, 2000	84	Mar. 20, 2001

The project length, from access preparation to well completion and evaluation, is approximately 18 weeks. As many of these dates have already passed, the developer will have to determine a new schedule when and if regulatory approval is granted.

3 REGULATORY ACTIVITY SUMMARY

On August 29, 2000, the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB) received from the developer applications for a Type 'A' Land Use Permit (Application #MV2000A0041) and a Type 'B' Water Licence (Application #MV2000L1-0009) to undertake the development.

The applications and supporting documentation were circulated to federal and territorial government departments, First Nations organizations and municipal governments. The comments received were taken into consideration by the MVLWB staff when they completed the preliminary screening on the development.

On November 20, 2000, the MVLWB referred the development proposal to the Review Board, in accordance with ss.126(1) of the MVRMA, citing the following reasons for the referral:

- *Exact quantities of H₂S (hydrogen sulfide) and SO₂ (sulfur dioxide) that would be released into the atmosphere as a result of incomplete combustion or venting of gases from this development proposal are unknown.*
- *The potential for deposition of waste from noncombusted gases released from flaring/venting operations in relation to the project area and proposed operations were not documented.*
- *The scope of the proposed development did not document when flaring or venting would be required and with what frequency.*
- *The application did not outline what the maximum allowable limits of H₂S and SO₂ emissions would be as a result of flaring activities.*
- *Levels of all other contaminants that can be released into and potentially contaminate the environment from project flaring or venting operations are unknown.*

The reasons identified were the concerns raised by the South Mackenzie Panel (SMP) of the MVLWB, not by the review of the development application by affected and/or interested stakeholders. The SMP concluded that the development activities "*might have a significant environmental impact*" and, therefore, referred the development application to the MVEIRB for an environmental assessment.

The Review Board was required by s.126 of the MVRMA to conduct an EA of the development. The Review Board issued public notification of the EA and contacted various organizations (government, non-government, and First Nations) so that they could identify the role they will be filling during the EA process.

Review Board staff reviewed the following documentation:

- The Water License and Land Use permit applications, including the accompanying environmental screening report submitted by the developer;
- The comments received from the developer, government and First Nations organizations during the application review period; and
- The MVLWB preliminary screening report and the reasons for the EA referral.

Based on the document review, Review Board staff suggested a course of action to the Review Board.

On December 7, 2000, the Review Board decided to accept the developer's environmental screening report on the Cameron Hills Drilling Project as the EA report with any additional information that is required from the developer to be obtained through other means.

Other instructions to the Review Board staff included:

- Prepare a draft work plan and draft terms of reference (ToR) based on the acceptance of the environmental screening report as the EA report. Distribute these documents to regulators, government, First Nations and the public and other interested parties for feed-back on this approach.
- Flaring and venting issues should be prominently addressed in the ToR and the EA report. As the environmental screening report is insufficient in the area of flaring and venting issues, request that the developer provide more extensive and detailed information to conform with the ToR.
- Advise the developer to continue to closely consult and inform the affected communities to mitigate socio-economic and traditional land use impacts.

4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The roles and responsibilities of the Review Board, Review Board staff and other parties in the EA are explained in the rest of this section.

4.1 Review Board

The Review Board is required to undertake the following in relation to this EA:

- conduct the EA, in accordance with ss.126(1) of the MVRMA;
- take into account any previous screening or assessment report made in relation to the development, in accordance with s.127 of the MVRMA;
- determine the scope of the development, in accordance with ss.117(1) of the MVRMA;
- consider several factors, in accordance with ss.117(2) of the MVRMA;
- make a determination regarding the environmental impacts and public concern of the development, in accordance with ss.128(1) of the MVRMA;
- report to the designated regulatory agency (the NEB) in accordance with ss.128(2) of the MVRMA;
- report to the federal Minister in accordance with ss.128(2) of the MVRMA; and,
- identify areas, and extent of effects, within or outside the Mackenzie Valley in which the development is likely to have a significant adverse impact or be a cause of significant public concern.

4.2 Review Board Staff

The Review Board's Executive Director and staff are the primary contacts for the developer, government bodies (federal and territorial departments and municipal governments), non-government organizations (NGOs), First Nations, expert advisors (these are non-government experts contracted directly by the Review Board), the public and other interested parties.

The staff member coordinating and facilitating this EA is Mr. Joe Acorn.

4.3 Other Parties

Government bodies may be involved in the EA process as:

- a Regulatory Authority (RA) to provide advice on regulatory matters;
- a pool of experts to assist the Review Board and provide advice related to environmental and socio-economic impacts; or
- both roles simultaneously.

Regulatory Authorities are those government bodies, such as Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) or Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), that provide licenses or permits that are required by a development. INAC and DFO would likely provide both regulatory advice in their roles as RAs and they would also provide technical expertise on specific aspects of a development. Other government bodies such as Environment Canada (EC)

or Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development (RWED) would likely just provide technical expertise due to their limited regulatory role.

An additional government body that is only involved in oil and gas related projects is the National Energy Board (NEB). Instead of being defined as an RA, the NEB is identified as a Designated Regulatory Agency (DRA). The NEB is the only body identified as a DRA in the MVRMA.

In addition to the pool of experts available within government, the Review Board may choose to hire expert advisors. Typically, these experts will be asked to provide a high level of technical expertise during the evaluation of specific sections of an EA report.

First Nations, NGOs, the public and other interested parties may provide the Review Board with information relevant to the EA of their own volition, or they may be asked by the Review Board to provide any relevant information they may have.

The developer may present additional information to the Review Board during the EA process. The Review Board also encourages the developer to continue consulting all affected communities and organizations. The Review Board will request the developer to provide a written record verifying consultations, including how the consultations may have influenced the design of any part of the development. The developer is expected to respond in a suitable and timely course to the EA Terms of Reference that will be issued by the Review Board.

All submissions received from all sources will be considered during the Review Board's decision-making process on the environmental assessment. These submissions will be public documents and will be posted on the Review Board's Public Registry. Submissions should be in a format that is easily available to all stakeholders.

Although any submissions related to the EA will be accepted by the Review Board, for these submissions to be effectively considered, it would be preferable if they were in a form that would be of most value to the Review Board. These submissions should:

- identify the development activity;
- identify the potential impacts of this activity (along with any supporting evidence);
- propose mitigative measures (along with evidence that the mitigative measures will work); and
- predict residual impacts that cannot be mitigated.

5 EA WORK PLAN

This section summarizes the process for the completion of an EA, in general, and this EA specifically.

5.1 *Milestones and Responsibilities*

Once a development proposal has been referred to the Review Board for an EA, the following milestones are established:

- ? Start-up of the EA;
- ? Advance consultation;
- ? Development description requirements;
- ? Work Planning;
- ? EA Terms of Reference;
- ? Developer's EA Report;
- ? Conformity Check;
- ? Deficiency Statement;
- ? Technical Analysis;
- ? Information Requests;
- ? Consultation; and,
- ? EA Decision.

The time allocations and the information requirements for each milestone will vary with each EA, and will depend upon the complexity, location and duration of the development. These will also vary depending upon the reasons for decision provided by the preliminary screener(s), and upon the information provided by the developer.

The EA process is outlined in Table 2, showing appropriate milestones and responsibility assignments.

Table 2 - Milestones and Responsibility Assignments for Steps in the EA

Milestone	Developer	Government Bodies	Other Parties	Staff	Board
Start-up of the EA					
Complete development description submitted					
Advance consultation					
Prepare draft Work Plan					
Review draft Work Plan					
Approve final Work Plan					
Prepare Draft Terms of Reference (ToR)					
Review draft ToR					

Milestone	Developer	Government Bodies	Other Parties	Staff	Board
EA ToR approved and issued					
Preparation and submission of EA Report					
Conformity check					
Deficiency statement					
EA analysis					
EA decision					
Consultation - throughout / as required					

Start-up of the EA

At the start of the EA, the developer, government bodies, NGOs, First Nations, expert advisors, the public and other interested parties are informed of the referral. The notification lets people know that while the development is in the EA process, no licence, permit or other authorization can be issued by government. As part of the referral, staff start a public registry on the development and start tracking development issues.

Notification of the referral is done by:

- ? Written notification
- ? News release
- ? Newspaper advertising

Tasks involved in starting the environmental assessment are listed below.

- ? Open case file
- ? Open public registry and registry log
- ? Public notification of referral
- ? Notify regulatory authorities of the referral
- ? Review Board notifies the developer of the referral

Deliverable: Public registry, public notification, government notification, developer notification, issue tracking, expert advisor identification, responsible authority self-identification.

Advance Consultation

Advance consultation is used to identify and inform stakeholders about the EA process and also to identify potential impacts, both environmental and socio-economic, that may need to be examined. Staff may conduct public information sessions and the developers would be asked to participate in these sessions to provide information about their development proposal. A stakeholder notification list is prepared and can include any of the following:

-
- Communities
 - NGOs
 - First Nations
 - Government
 - Developer
 - Other interested parties such as businesses or members of the public.

Advance consultation would parallel the developer submitting additional information as required by the Review Board for work planning purposes. Development of the draft EA Work Plan by Review Board staff would also occur concurrently with advance consultation.

Advance scoping meetings and discussions with government bodies and experts may be held to review the referral, the development description, and other supporting information provided by the developer. Potential environmental and socio-economic impacts due to the development are also discussed.

The Review Board may choose to participate in a site visit if it is felt necessary. This will be arranged with the developer and a general notification of the site visit will be issued to the public.

Deliverable: Awareness of the Review Board, the EA process and the development proposal. Any relevant issues raised by the public and stakeholders during this advance consultation step would be noted and brought to the attention of the Review Board for possible inclusion in the EA Terms of Reference.

Development Description Requirements

The Review Board may require a more detailed and complete description of the proposed development from the developer. This would enable the Review Board to determine a proper scope of development and issue a complete set of EA Terms of Reference that address all phases and components of the development. The developer is responsible for providing a development description that is suitable for consultation with Aboriginal, public and government stakeholders.

The Review Board would inform stakeholders of its direction to the developer using the following involvement methods:

- ? Fax out of Review Board's direction to the developer;
- ? News release to media;
- ? Newspaper advertising informing people of the overall EA process and the Review Board's direction to the developer.

The developer will be responsible for providing its final development description to all identified stakeholders.

Deliverable: A complete description of the proposed development provided by the developer to the Review Board and identified stakeholders.

Work Planning and Time Frames

A work plan for completing the EA will be developed by staff, in consultation with stakeholders. Each work plan is unique as is every development proposal referred to EA. For example, if the developer completed and submitted a detailed EA Report along with any application(s) that triggered the EA, that information could affect the length of time and level of effort spent on a particular step in the EA process. This would be reflected in the draft Work Plan. An estimate of resource requirements for completing the EA would also be developed. This draft Work Plan would be developed concurrently during the advance consultation phase.

Once the advance consultation phase is completed, the draft Work Plan would be presented to the Review Board for its approval. The draft Work Plan would then be released for review by other stakeholders. The draft Work Plan may be amended based upon comments received from the review. The amended work plan would then be presented to the Review Board for final approval and adoption of the Work Plan.

Deliverable: An approved Work Plan, including an estimate of resource requirements, for completing the EA.

EA Terms of Reference and Scope of Development Determination

The EA Terms of Reference (ToR) are the Review Board's instructions to the developer and are designed to ensure that the appropriate information is provided to understand the environmental consequences and the benefits of the proposed development. The ToR are prepared based on the development description provided by the developer and any other relevant information. The ToR also provide the scope of the development¹ and scope of assessment¹ determination of the Review Board.

Staff will coordinate the preparation of the draft ToR for consultation with other parties. After the Review Board's consideration and approval of the ToR, they are issued to the developer and others as required.

Deliverable: Draft and final Terms of Reference, direction to the developer including confirmed scope of development and associated scope of assessment, identification of key issues, effects, baseline data requirements, and desired results of research, and suggested environmental assessment report table of contents.

Preparation and Submission of the EA Report

The developer will use the EA Terms of Reference to complete its EA report and tell the

¹Defined in Appendix 1.

a story of how people and the natural world could be changed by the proposed development and what is to be done about these changes.

As a minimum, the EA report should include the following:

- ? Title (of the development proposal);
- ? Executive summary (translated into appropriate aboriginal languages);
- ? Description of the development (e.g., phases, timetables, location, maps, photos, technology used, alternatives to the development, development design details taking into account the environment);
- ? Description of the existing environment, including environmental interactions (e.g., natural and human setting);
- ? Impact of the development on the environment, including those caused by malfunctions or accidents, and any cumulative impact(s);
- ? List of potential impacts and the proposed mitigation or remedial measures;
- ? Identification and description of the residual impacts following mitigation or remedial measures;
- ? Results and summary of issues from public and community consultation, including any concerns;
- ? Plans for any environmental management plan, follow-up and monitoring;
- ? List of supporting evidence and information sources, including previous environmental assessments; and
- ? List of the required licences, permits and other authorizations, if relevant.

Deliverable: An EA report from the developer that addresses the requirements of the EA Terms of Reference, and additional information from other sources as directed by the Review Board.

Conformity Check

After receiving the developer's completed EA report the Review Board will ensure the developer has provided the information requested in the Terms of Reference. Opportunity is provided for parties having expressed an interest to be involved in the EA to contribute to this stage. **Note:** *This conformity check determines whether or not the developer has responded to what was asked for in the EA Terms of Reference; it does not reflect the technical adequacy of the information provided by the developer. Any additional technical information, or further explanation, required would be requested through information requests (IR's). IR's would facilitate the technical analysis of the development.*

Where a developer has submitted a satisfactory EA report with the original application (e.g., at preliminary screening or at the start of the EA), this conformity check would likely occur shortly after the Review Board's approval and release of the EA Terms of Reference.

The Review Board will decide conformity and, where required, issue a deficiency statement if needed.

Deliverable: Review Board issues deficiency statement on the developer's EA report.

Technical Analysis

The Review Board's staff will coordinate the analysis of the EA. The aim is to provide opportunities for RA's, federal and territorial governments, First Nations, the public and other interested parties to participate in the EA process and express their ideas, and present their information (e.g., traditional knowledge holders and scientific experts) to the Review Board. The more complete the analysis, the better the EA. This is a critical stage in the EA process where the key issues and impacts are identified and opportunities for public input in a public forum are possible.

The analysis identifies unresolved issues and environmental impacts, and provides possible suggestions for addressing the issues and impacts. Where unresolved or unclear issues or impacts are identified, the developer, and other appropriate parties (e.g., RAs, experts) will have the opportunity of responding. The developer can formally provide and present its views on the information brought to the Review Board's attention after submission of its environmental assessment report including any proposed amendments, additions or refinements to the development or the environmental assessment.

The Review Board tries to secure a sound technical analysis and where warranted will conduct public meetings and hearings. At public meetings or hearing, it is important that those that want to speak have an opportunity to speak and to listen to others speak.

Deliverable: Technical reports from participants that clearly state the reviewer's conclusions, recommendations and supporting rationales.

Information Requests

Throughout the Conformity Check and Technical Analysis phases of the EA, the Review Board and stakeholders may have additional information needs for technical analysis of the developer's environmental assessment report. This information would be requested through the use of IRs. These IRs and responses would form part of the public registry and body of evidence or information the Review Board would consider.

The IRs represent very specific and focused requests for clarification or additional information, required in order for the party or parties requesting the information to complete its analysis and reach a conclusion about the developers EA report and proposed development.

The Review Board in its Work Plan would identify milestone dates for the submission of IR's and also identify response dates. Depending on the technical adequacy of the information submitted in the developers EA Report, there could be two rounds of IRs during an EA. If a third round were required, then the Work Plan would be revised after the developer and other interested participants were informed and provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed work plan amendment.

Deliverable: Responses to Information Requests are placed on the public registry and circulated to all stakeholders to assist in their analysis of the environmental assessment report.

Consultation

The Review Board may decide a round of public hearings is warranted to discuss the developers EA report and stakeholder responses. This consultation could take one of two forms:

- a forum where people make their presentations about the development proposal to the Review Board; or
- a formal hearing where people could, under certain rules developed by the Review Board, ask questions to any other stakeholder².

Deliverable: A public hearing for the Review Board to listen to and get additional information about the EA, the development proposal and the conclusions reached by stakeholders in filed documents.

EA Decision and Written Reasons

The Review Board will prepare its determination after considering the EA Report, its analysis, and the information on the Public Registry. The Review Board will then prepare its written reasons. The Review Board will give the Minister of DIAND, and when required the NEB, its written reasons. The Minister of DIAND, and the NEB when required, will distribute them to every responsible minister. The referring bodies and the developer also receive copies of the Review Board's written reasons.

Staff would work with the Review Board in the preparation of its Report of EA and written reasons.

Deliverable: Report of the Review Board on the EA, with decision and written reasons.

5.2 EA Work Plan Schedule

Table 3 provides an estimated timeline for completing each indicated milestone in the *Cameron Hills Drilling Project* EA process. The Review Board may amend the milestone dates at its discretion.

Table 3 - Milestone Completion Timetable

Milestone	Date
Start-up of the EA	November 20
Complete development description submitted	November 20
Advance consultation and draft Work Plan developed	December 13
Prepare draft Terms of Reference	December 13

²See Appendix 1 for a definition of "the right to be heard".

Milestone	Date
Review of draft Work Plan and draft Terms of Reference	January 5
Work Plan and Terms of Reference approved and issued by Review Board	January 15
Preparation and submission of EA Report by Developer	January 17
Conformity check	January 24
Deficiency statement (If required)	January 25
Last day for submission of Information Requests	January 26
Submission of IR responses (If required)	February 2
Submission of RA and others technical reports	February 9
Closure of Public Registry	February 16
EA decision	by February 23
Federal Minister's response to the Review Board's Report of EA, if required	-
Consultation - throughout / as required	-

APPENDIX 1

1.0 Review Board Legal Context for Environmental Assessment

The Review Board, in exercising its authority is guided by the following legal principles and by definitions, purposes and factors found in the MVRMA. This context provides the developer, RA's, the DRA (NEB) as required, federal and territorial governments, First Nations, expert advisors, and other affected or interested parties the framework within which the EA will be conducted.

1.1 Legal Principles

The Review Board is governed by the rules of natural justice and procedural fairness. This essentially means that fair play is required when exercising decision making functions. Three of the basic elements are:

(i) **The right to be heard** - means providing fair opportunity for parties to prepare and state their case, and to correct or contradict relevant statements prejudicial to their position;

(ii) **The rule against bias** - is a rule against prejudging a case; addressing not only actual bias but also any reasonable apprehension of bias; and,

(iii) **Fettering of discretion** - means the Review Board is governed by the common law principle which requires that As/he who hears must decide. This means that the Board members who hear or review the evidence in an EA must be the decision makers. Members who did not participate can play no role in the decision. The law also requires that the Board and its members must be free to exercise their full authorities under the statute. The Board must decide each case on its own merits.

1.2 Definitions

The context within which the Review Board conducts an EA is based on following definitions and indicated sections from the MVRMA.

Development - means any undertaking, or any part of an undertaking, that is carried out on land or water and, except where the context otherwise indicates, wholly within the Mackenzie Valley, and includes measures carried out by a department or agency of government leading to the establishment of a national park subject to the National Parks Act and an acquisition of lands pursuant to the Historic Sites and Monuments Act.

Environment - means the components of the Earth and includes

- land, water and air, including all layers of the atmosphere;
- all organic and inorganic matter and living organisms; and

-
- the interacting natural systems that include components referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b).

Follow-up program - means a program for evaluating

- the soundness of an environmental assessment or environmental impact review of a proposal for a development; and
- the effectiveness of the mitigative or remedial measures imposed as conditions of approval of the proposal.

Harvesting - in relation to wildlife, means hunting, trapping or fishing activities carried on in conformity with a land claim agreement or, in respect of persons and places not subject to a land claim agreement, carried on pursuant to aboriginal or treaty rights.

Heritage resources - means archaeological or historic sites, burial sites, artifacts and other objects of historical, cultural or religious significance, and historical or cultural records.

Impact on the environment - means any effect on land, water, air or any other component of the environment, as well as on wildlife harvesting, and includes any effect on the social and cultural environment or on heritage resources.

Mitigative or remedial measure - means a measure for the control, reduction or elimination of an adverse impact of a development on the environment, including a restorative measure.

Scope of assessment - the components of the environment that will be evaluated for impacts from the proposed development.

Scope of development - a description of the development and associated parts as determined by the Review Board.

s.114 *The purpose of this Part is to establish a process comprising a preliminary screening, an environmental assessment and an environmental impact review in relation to proposals for developments, and*

- to establish the Review Board as the main instrument in the Mackenzie Valley for the environmental assessment and environmental impact review of developments;
- to ensure that the impact on the environment of proposed developments receives careful consideration before actions are taken in connection with them; and
- to ensure that the concerns of aboriginal people and the general public are taken into account in that process.

s.115 *The process established by this Part shall be carried out in a timely and expeditious manner and shall have regard to*

-
- the protection of the environment from the significant adverse impacts of proposed developments; and
 - the protection of the social, cultural and economic well-being of residents and communities in the Mackenzie Valley.

ss.117(1) Every environmental assessment of a proposal for a development shall include a determination by the Review Board of the scope of the development, subject to any guidelines made under section 120.

ss.117(2) Every environmental assessment and environmental impact review of a proposal for a development shall include a consideration of:

- ? the impact of the development on the environment, including the impact of malfunctions or accidents that may occur in connection with the development and any cumulative impact that is likely to result from the development in combination with other developments;
- ? the significance of any such impact;
- ? any comments submitted by members of the public in accordance with the regulations or the rules of practice and procedure of the Review Board;
- ? where the development is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment, the imposition of mitigative or remedial measures; and
- ? any other matter, such as the need for the development and any available alternatives to it, that the Review Board or any responsible minister, after consulting with the Review Board, determines to be relevant.