

# Index

---

- administrative guidance
    - Canada 132
    - Finland 42
    - Greenland 174
    - Iceland 98
    - Norway 83–4
    - Russia 195–6
    - Sweden 64
    - US 154–5, 205
  - agencies
    - lead agency responsibilities, US 144, 146, 148, 151, 155–6, 159
    - project monitoring, Finland EIA system 47
  - Alaska *see* US, EIA legislation, State of Alaska
  - Alberta Province *see* Canada, EIA systems, Alberta Province EIA legislation
  - Alta Declaration 246, 259
  - alternatives consideration
    - Canada 107
    - Finland 44, 231–2
    - Norway 235
    - Russia 185, 196, 198
    - Sweden 239
    - US 148–9, 151, 158–9
  - see also* mitigation measures
  - aluminium smelters
    - Greenland 179–80
    - Iceland 100, 219
  - appeal process
    - Finland 38
    - Iceland 92, 93, 97
    - Norway 75, 76
    - Sweden 57, 59, 61
    - US 155, 214
  - aquaculture, Norway 84, 87, 213
  - Arctic Council
    - Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA) 1–2
    - Arctic Offshore Oil & Gas Guidelines 166
    - traditional knowledge 273
    - see also* Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS)
  - Arctic EIA, future of 257–8
  - Arctic-specific thresholds, lack of 260
  - best practices, moving towards 260
  - climate change 257
  - economic globalization effects on biodiversity 257
  - industrialization sustainability focus 257–8
  - international industry standards and corporate social responsibility 257–8
  - private sector involvement 257–8
  - public outreach strategies 258
- Arctic EIA Guidelines 202–22
  - Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) 11–13, 29, 245, 246–7
  - baseline information 263, 270
  - benchmark for EIA practices, Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) 13
  - best practices 204, 205–6, 207, 208–9, 218–19
  - climate change 218
  - corporate stewardship 218–19
  - cumulative effects analysis 206–7
  - current challenges 259–60
  - current relevance, Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) 12–13
  - EIA document preparation 268–9
  - impact prediction and evaluation 264–5
  - indigenous peoples' engagement 206

- mitigation 265–7
- monitoring 267–8, 269, 270
- new approaches 216–17
- new types of projects and renewable energy 217
- not best practices 210–16
- practice consistent with Guidelines 207–16
- practices exceeding 202–7
- private governance innovations 219–20
- public participation 203, 269–72, 273, 274
- public–private partnerships (PPPs) 219
- regional environmental assessments 257, 259
- scoping 263, 270
- screening 262
- social issues, focus on 203
- ‘social licence’ concept 259
- stakeholder engagement best practices 203, 205–6, 208–9, 218–19
- traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) 203, 209–10, 272–3
- transboundary impacts 273–4
- Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS)
  - Alta Declaration 246, 259
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 11–13, 29, 245, 246–7
  - Inuvik Declaration 246
  - Nuuk Declaration 245–6
  - see also* Arctic Council
- army bases, Sweden 63
- Bardach, E. 18–19, 21, 23
- Barzelay, M. 21
- baseline data
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 263, 270
  - Canada 119
  - Canada, Alberta 128
  - Greenland 168–9, 175
  - Iceland 100, 219
  - Norway 82
  - Sweden 63, 65, 66–7
  - US 143, 158
- Bastmeijer, K. 4, 228
- Beaufort Regional Environmental Assessment Area (BREA) 131, 217, 259
  - see also* Canada, EIA systems
- Bendixsen, S. 15–16, 20
- berry picking, economic impact, Finland EIA system 46, 212
- best practice research 15–27
  - best practice definitions 15–16, 29–33
  - best practice methodology 18, 19, 23–4
  - context importance 16
  - critiques and limitations 22–4
  - elements 19–20
  - evidence-based practice comparison 16–17
  - external validity concerns 23
  - extrapolation process 20–22, 23
  - input to output relationship 21
  - negative examples, learning from 24
  - production theory models 17–18
  - questionnaire and benchmarking 31
  - reverse engineering protocol 21–2
  - risk and extrapolation protocol 22
  - scientific criticisms 22–3
  - selection bias and validity concerns 23
  - smart practice methodology 18–19
  - source sites 19–20
  - target sites 19–20, 24
  - theory 17–18
- best practices
  - Arctic EIA, future of 260
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 204, 205–6, 207, 208–9, 218–19
  - Canada 119–21, 126–9, 204–5, 206, 209–10, 217
  - Canada, Alberta Province 126–9, 206, 217
  - Canada, Yukon Territory 119–21, 204–5, 207, 208, 216–17
  - Finland 40, 42–51, 206, 208, 210, 217–18
  - Greenland 174–80, 208–9, 219
  - Iceland 100–102, 205, 206, 207, 219
  - Norway 82–3, 84–5, 86, 87, 204, 207, 208
  - not best practices, Arctic EIA Guidelines 210–16
  - Russia 196–8, 209

- Sweden 57–8, 64–70, 205, 206
- US 155–9, 160, 205, 206–7, 209, 210
- Bogdan, M. 236, 237
- Boyd, K. 15, 22, 23, 24
- Bretschneider, S. 15, 17, 18, 19, 21
- Brun, J. 233, 234, 235, 236
- Canada, EIA systems 105–41
  - administrative guidance 132
  - alternatives, consideration of 107
  - baseline information 119
  - Beaufort Regional Environmental Assessment Area (BREA) 131, 217, 259
  - best practices 119–21, 126–9, 204–5, 206, 209–10, 217
  - Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) 105–7, 114, 214, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245
  - Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEA Agency) 106, 107
  - climate change concerns 218
  - criticism of 214
  - Draft Report 117, 119, 127–8
  - environmental assessment by MVEIRB 109–10
  - Environmental Assessment and Panel Review 106
  - ‘environmental effect’ definition 106
  - and Espoo Convention 241
  - expert reviewers 30
  - federal environmental assessment panel review of NIRB legislation 113
  - federal legislation 105–7
  - Final Report 110, 124–5, 130
  - First Nation consultation 10, 109, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 126–7, 129, 130, 208, 210
  - interviews 32, 285–6
  - land use planning 109, 130
  - Mackenzie Valley Impact Review Board (MVEIRB) 108–11
  - Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act 108–11
  - mining industry 119, 124, 127, 128, 130–31, 208, 216–17
  - mitigation measures 107, 111, 117, 120, 127, 218, 242, 243
  - monitoring and mandatory follow-up programmes 107, 244
  - National Energy Board Act 107, 241
  - northern territories EIA systems 28–9
  - northern territories regulatory systems 108–13
  - Northwest Territories EIA legislation 108–11, 119, 216
  - Nuclear Safety and Control Act 107, 241
  - Nunavut EIA legislation 111–13, 119, 216
  - Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) 111–13
  - Nunavut Land Claims Agreement Act 111, 112
  - Oil and Gas Operations Act 107, 241
  - permit process 109, 110, 113, 114, 122
  - public participation 107, 109, 110, 112, 121–2, 123, 127, 129, 242, 245, 258
  - Review Panel 106, 107, 241, 242, 243–4
  - scoping 106, 110, 111, 116–17, 119–20, 126–7
  - screening 108–9, 112–13, 116–17, 119–20, 123, 126
  - significant adverse environmental impact 119–20, 122, 128, 243
  - socio-economic impacts 106–7, 108, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 120, 126, 130, 203, 207, 217, 258
  - stakeholder involvement 107, 109, 112, 121–2, 129, 131, 206, 208, 242, 244
  - Standard EA Process 107, 241–2
  - sustainability focus 121, 122
  - technical review 110, 113, 124, 242
  - traditional knowledge 113, 119, 129, 130, 132, 210, 216
  - transboundary EIA 240–45, 289–95
  - Valued Ecosystem Components (VECs) 131, 209–10
  - wildlife and adaptive management thresholds, importance of 120
- Canada, EIA systems, Alberta
  - Province EIA legislation 29, 121–9, 217

- best practices 126–9, 206, 217
- climate change concerns 218
- consultancy use 127, 128, 132
- criticism of 126
- cumulative impact assessment 124, 127–8, 131, 206, 217
- database production 128
- Energy Regulator 122, 124
- Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act (EPEA) 121
- Natural Resources Conservation Board 124
- oil sands mining projects 124, 127, 128, 130–31, 206, 217, 259
- proposal review 122–3, 126
- public participation 121–2, 123, 127, 129, 258
- Regional Strategic Environmental Assessment 217, 259
- scoping 126–7
- screening 123, 126
- technical review 124, 127, 128
- Canada, EIA systems, Yukon Territory EIA legislation 114–21, 216–17
- adequacy review 119
- best practices 119–21, 204–5, 207, 208, 216–17
- consultancy use 119, 120
- designated office evaluation (DOE) 115, 116
- Executive Committee screenings 115, 116–17
- land claims and Umbrella Final Agreement (UFA) 130
- Panels of the Board Review 115, 117
- public participation 121, 208
- Screening Report 119–20
- Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Act (YESAA) 114, 120, 204–5, 207
- Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board (YESAB) 114–15, 119, 120, 130, 204–5, 216
- Christiansen, A. 182
- Clancy, E. 227
- climate change concerns
  - Arctic EIA, future of 257
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 218
  - Canada 218
  - Norway 218
  - US 158, 210, 213
- communication preferences, Sweden 63–4, 69–70
- conflict avoidance agreements, US 156, 157–8
- Connelly, R. 224
- consultancy use
  - Canada, Alberta Province 127, 128, 132
  - Canada, Yukon Territory 119, 120
  - Finland 43, 45–6
  - Greenland 175, 178
  - Iceland 98, 100, 101
  - Norway 82, 84, 85–6, 87
  - Russia 196
  - Sweden 58, 64, 66
  - US 156–7, 158
- corporate social responsibility (CSR) 11
  - Finland 40
  - Greenland 172
  - Norway 83
  - US 156
  - see also* international industry standards; social impact assessment
- corporate stewardship, Arctic EIA Guidelines 218–19
- Craik, A. 30
- criticism of EIA systems
  - Canada 214
  - Canada, Alberta Province 126
  - Finland 40–41, 47, 48–9, 211–12
  - Greenland 214–15
  - Iceland 98, 212–13
  - Norway 213
  - Russia 215–16
  - Sweden 215
  - US 213–14
- cumulative impact assessment
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 206–7
  - Canada, Alberta Province 124, 127–8, 131, 206, 217
  - Finland 37
  - Greenland 176
  - Iceland 98, 206, 212–13
  - Norway 86, 213, 235

- Sweden 239
- US 145, 149, 210
- Curtis, J. 30
- database production *see* baseline data
- Denmark
  - Danish Centre for Environment and Energy (DCE) 168, 170
  - hydropower project impact 10
- Doelle, M. 106, 242, 244
- Draft Report
  - Canada 117, 119, 127–8
  - EIA questionnaire 278
  - Finland 35–6, 38
  - Greenland 169, 170, 176
  - Iceland 94
  - Norway 85–6
  - Russia 196–7
  - Sweden 60, 66–7
  - US 148–9, 150, 151, 158–9
- economic crisis effects, Iceland 103
- economic focus, criticism of, Norway 82
- economic globalization effects 199, 257
- EIA questionnaire 277–9
- EIAs
  - basic elements 4–6
  - language use and terminology 5–6
  - and sustainable development principle 6–7
- Ejdemo, T. 56, 67
- Endangered Species Act, US 149, 157
- endangered species data, Sweden 67
- energy regulation
  - Canada 107, 122, 124, 241
  - Norway 72, 84
  - see also* geothermal projects; hydropower; wind power
- engineering-ecological surveys, Russia 186, 191
- Enocksson, E. 237, 238, 239, 240, 249
- ‘environmental effect’ definition, Canada 106
- Espoo Convention 11, 72, 184–5, 223–41*passim*, 246, 247, 249–50
- EU
  - European Commission’s LIFE + project, IMPERIA 45
  - Habitats Directive and Natura 2000 assessment 41
  - EU EIA Directive 223
    - Finland 35, 229, 231–2, 235
    - Greenland 164, 175, 214
    - Iceland 92, 93
    - Norway 72, 233, 234
    - Sweden 54, 237, 239
  - EU Habitats Directive and Natura 2000 assessment 41, 44–5, 47, 67
  - European Commission LIFE + project, IMPERIA 45
  - expert reviewers 30
  - extrapolation process, best practice research 20–22, 23
- Final Report
  - Canada 110, 124–5, 130
  - EIA questionnaire 278–9
  - Finland 37, 45–7
  - Greenland 167–8, 170, 176–7
  - Iceland 96, 101
  - Norway 86–7
  - Russia 197
  - Sweden 67–8
  - US 143, 149, 151, 159
  - see also* permit process
- Finland EIA system 35–53
  - administrative guidance in northern Finland 42
  - agency roles and project monitoring 47
  - appeal process 38
  - berry picking, economic impact 46, 212
  - best practices 40, 42–51, 206, 208, 210, 217–18
  - companies’ role and international corporate standards 40
  - consultancy use in EIA preparation 43, 45–6
  - Coordinating Authority’s statement on EIA Report 38
  - criticism of 40–41, 47, 48–9, 211–12
  - cumulative impact 37
  - Draft Report 35–6, 38
  - EIA Act 11, 229–31
  - EIA Decree 229, 230, 231–2
  - EIA legislation 35–53

- EIA Report, Final Report and follow-up 37, 45–7
- ELY Centre 40, 42, 43
- Environmental Impact Assessment Procedure Act 35
- and Espoo Convention 229, 231, 232
- and EU EIA Directive 35, 229, 231–2, 235
- EU Habitats Directive and Natura 2000 assessment 41, 44–5, 47
- and European Commission's LIFE + project, IMPERIA 45
- expert reviewers 30
- harmonization of legislation, need for 41
- hydropower companies 11, 43, 48, 208
- indigenous peoples' livelihoods 42, 44–5, 46, 47, 49, 50–51
- industry standards 40
- interviews 32, 280–81
- Kaunisvaara project 247–52
- land use planning 37, 50
- Lapland studies 44–5, 49, 50–51, 211–12
- mining industry 40, 41, 42, 44, 45–6, 47, 48, 49, 211, 258
- Ministry of the Environment 230, 231, 232, 250, 251–2
- mitigation measures 40, 49, 50
- 'no project' alternative 44, 231–2
- non-discrimination principle of Espoo Convention 231
- non-integrated application process 48–9
- peat industry 45, 48, 211
- permit process 38, 40–41, 43, 46–7
- private sector and best practices in EIA 40
- public consultation 3, 11, 36–7, 40–41, 44, 45–6, 47–9, 50, 208, 211, 212, 230–31, 232, 248, 249, 251
- reindeer herding studies 42, 44–5, 46, 47, 49, 50–51, 206, 210, 212, 252, 258
- right of appeal 38
- Sami community 46, 248, 252
- scoping 36–7, 43–5, 229
- screening 36, 37, 42–3
- social impact assessments 49–51, 212
- stakeholder involvement 41, 45, 46, 48–51, 206, 208, 210, 211, 212, 248
- Tekes project *viii* 31, 45
- thresholds of significance 46
- transboundary EIA 229–32, 247–52, 289–93
- update requirement, need for 47
- wind power companies 42, 44, 45, 46, 50, 217–18, 258
- First Nation consultation, Canada 10, 109, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 121, 126–7, 129, 130, 208, 210
- fishing 151, 172
- salmon aquaculture, Norway 84, 87, 213
- whaling, US 157–8, 160
- forestry, Sweden 61–3
- future of Arctic EIA *see* Arctic EIA, future of
- Galbraith, L. 121
- geothermal projects, Iceland 100
- Gibson, R. 134
- Gilpin, A. 4
- Greenland, EIA legislation 163–83
- administrative guidance 174
- aluminium smelter plant 179–80
- Arctic Council's Arctic Offshore Oil & Gas Guidelines 166
- baseline data and site surveys 168–9, 175
- best practices 174–80, 208–9, 219
- combined permit/EIA application system 165
- consultancy use 175, 178
- Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) standards, promotion of 172
- criticism of 214–15
- cultural sensitivity, importance of 176
- cumulative impact assessment 176
- Danish Centre for Environment and Energy (DCE) 168, 170
- Draft EIA Report 169, 170, 176
- Environment Agency for the Mineral Resources Area (EAMRA) 165, 167, 168, 170

- Environmental Management Plan  
and identified impacts 169  
and EU EIA Directive 164, 175,  
214  
expert reviewers 30  
final EIA Report 167–8, 170, 176–7  
fishing and Marine Stewardship  
Council certification 172  
Greenland Institute for Natural  
Resources (GINR) 165, 168,  
170, 177  
hydrocarbon and mineral  
exploitation guidelines 166–7,  
169, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176–7  
hydropower projects 10, 173, 176  
Impact and Benefit Agreement  
(IBA) 174, 178–9, 208–9, 219  
interviews 32, 283–5  
language and translation problems  
174  
local expertise use 175, 176, 203  
Mineral Licensing and Safety  
Authority (MLSA) 166–7  
Mineral Resources Act (MRA) 128,  
164–7, 173–4, 178, 214  
mining 164, 166–7, 169, 170, 173,  
174, 175, 176–7, 209  
Ministry of Industry and Mineral  
Resources (MIM) 214  
mitigation measures 167–8, 176  
monitoring 176–7, 214–15  
Nature Protection Act 164, 173  
NGO involvement 172, 174, 175–6,  
177, 179, 209  
noticing requirements 166  
Nuuk port expansion project 164,  
173, 179  
offshore oil and gas activities 164  
OSPAR Guidelines 166  
political status effects 163, 172  
private sector involvement 172  
public consultation 164, 165–6,  
167–8, 169, 170, 177–8, 179  
scoping 167, 168–9, 175–6, 177, 209,  
214–15  
screening 167, 175  
Self-Government Act 163  
Self-Government Order on the  
Assessment of Plant Effects on  
Environment 164, 167  
significant impact assessment 165  
Social Sustainability Assessment  
(SSAs) 165, 173–4, 178–80, 203,  
209  
stakeholder involvement 166, 170,  
178–80  
sustainability focus 165–6, 172,  
173–4, 177, 178–9  
sustainable practices, focus on 172  
White Paper 168, 170  
Guchteneire, P. de 15–16, 20  
Guidelines *see* Arctic EIA Guidelines
- Hall, J. 16, 17  
Hansen, T. 174, 219  
Harrop, O. 4  
Hedlund, A. 58  
Henaug, C. 30  
Hendry, J. 142, 143  
Hilden, M. 54  
Hokkanen, P. 35  
hush money and indigenous peoples  
69–70  
*see also* Sweden, EIA legislation  
hydrocarbons *see* offshore oil and gas  
hydropower projects  
Finland EIA system 11, 43, 48,  
208  
Greenland, EIA legislation 10, 173,  
176  
Iceland 98  
*see also* energy regulation; wind  
power
- Iceland, EIA legislation 92–104  
administrative guidance 98  
aluminium smelters 100, 219  
appeal process 92, 93, 97  
baseline data 100, 219  
best practices 100–102, 205, 206,  
207, 219  
consultancy use 98, 100, 101  
criticisms of 98, 212–13  
cumulative impact assessments 98,  
206, 212–13  
Draft Report 94  
economic crisis effects 103  
EIA Act 93, 95, 96, 97  
Environment Agency (EA) 92  
Environmental Act 92

- Environmental and Natural Resources Board of Appeal 93, 97
- and EU EIA Directive 92, 93
- expert reviewers 30
- final EIS 96, 101
- geothermal projects 100
- hydropower projects 98
- Initial Environmental Impact Statement (IEIS) 94–5, 100–101
- Initial Environmental Impact Statement (IEIS), NPA review 95–6, 97
- interviews 32, 283
- mitigation measures 95, 96, 100, 101
- monitoring 97, 98, 101
- National Planning Agency (NPA) 92, 93, 95–6, 97, 206
- permits 94, 96, 97
- project advertising 95, 96, 97
- Promote Iceland 219
- public consultation 96, 98, 100, 101, 102, 207, 212
- public-private partnerships (PPPs) 98, 101, 219
- Regulations on Environmental Impact Assessment 92
- revision of EIS 97
- scoping 94, 95, 100, 207
- screening 93, 97
- social impact assessment 102, 212
- stakeholder involvement 95–6, 101, 102
- visual impacts 100–101, 219
- Ignatyeva, I. 30
- impact assessment *see* significant environmental impact assessment; social impact assessment
- Indigenous Peoples Secretariat 274
- industrialization sustainability focus, and future of Arctic EIA 257–8
- International Association of Impact Assessment (IAIA) Principles 275–6
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) on EIAs 4
- Pulp Mills* 225–7
- international industry standards 40, 67, 216, 257–8
- see also* corporate social responsibility
- International Seabed Authority 228
- interviews for research 31–3, 280–88
- Inuit Circumpolar Conference 175, 209, 274
- Inuvik Declaration, Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) 246
- Isak, K. 30
- Jantunen, J. 35
- Jennings, E. 16, 17
- Jensby, A. 181, 182
- Jerdenius, S. 237, 238, 240, 251
- Jokelainen, T. 30
- Kaunisvaara project, Finland and Sweden 247–52
- Keskitalo, C. 1
- Kiev Protocol 72
- Kjellander, C. 58
- Kluwe, J. 30
- knowledge, principle, Sweden 64, 65–6, 69, 215
- Kristinsdóttir, R. 30
- land use planning
  - Canada 109, 130
  - Finland 37, 50
  - Norway 72–3, 74–5, 76–80, 85, 204, 233
  - Russia 185–6, 188, 191, 195
  - Sweden 54, 55–6, 61–3, 69–70
  - US 142, 152, 154
- language and translation problems, Greenland 174
- Lapland
  - Finland 44–5, 49, 50–51, 211–12
  - Sweden 61–3
- Lefevre, J. 157
- Lofoten–Barents Sea plan, Norway 204
- Marine Stewardship Council certification, Greenland 172
- Meltofte, H. 257
- Minerals Management Service (MMS), US, EIA legislation 151, 213–14



- mining industry
  - Canada 119, 124, 127, 128, 130–31, 206, 208, 216–17, 259
  - Finland 40, 41, 42, 44, 45–6, 47, 48, 49, 211, 258
  - Greenland 164, 166–7, 169, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176–7, 209
  - Norway 74, 84, 86, 87–8, 208
  - Sweden 56–8, 68, 215
- mitigation measures
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 265–7
  - Canada 107, 111, 117, 120, 127, 218, 242, 243
  - Finland 40, 49, 50
  - Greenland 167–8, 176
  - Iceland 95, 96, 100, 101
  - Norway 74, 80, 85, 86, 236
  - Sweden 68, 251–2
  - US 146, 149, 157–8, 159
  - see also* alternatives consideration
- Møller, S. 30
- monitoring
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 267–8, 269, 270
  - Canada 107, 244
  - Finland 47
  - Greenland 176–7, 214–15
  - Iceland 97, 98, 101
  - Norway 74, 76, 86–7, 236
  - Sweden 67–8
  - US 149, 159
- Mortensen, B. 30, 173, 174, 179, 219
- Myers, S. 23
- Nekola, M. 23
- Nguyễn-Duy, I. 232, 233
- Nixon, Ashley 4
- Northwest Territories EIA
  - legislation, Canada 108–11, 119, 216
- Norway, EIA legislation 72–91
  - administrative guidance 83–4
  - alternatives requirement 235
  - appeal process 75, 76
  - aquaculture 84, 87, 213
  - baseline data 82
  - best practices 82–3, 84–5, 86, 87, 204, 207, 208
  - climate change concerns 218
  - consultancy use 82, 84, 85–6, 87
  - corporate social responsibility (CSR) 83
  - criticism of 213
  - cultural assessment study 86
  - Cultural Heritage Act 77
  - cumulative impact assessment 86, 213, 235
  - databases and centralized information 82
  - Department of Roads – Road Authorities Handbook and thresholds for significance 82, 86
  - draft EIS preparation 85–6
  - economic focus, criticism of 82
  - Energy Act 72
  - energy production 84
  - Environmental Impact Statement 78–80
  - Espoo Convention 72, 233–4, 235
  - and EU EIA Directive 72, 233, 234
  - expert reviewers 30
  - final EIS and follow-up 86–7
  - Finnmark Act 83
  - indigenous peoples 77, 83–4, 85, 88
  - interviews 32, 282–3
  - Kiev Protocol 72
  - land use planning 72–3, 74–5, 76–80, 85, 204, 233
  - Lofoten–Barents Sea plan 204
  - mining industry 74, 84, 86, 87–8, 208
  - Ministry of the Environment 75, 234, 235
  - mitigation measures 74, 80, 85, 86, 236
  - monitoring programmes 74, 76, 86–7, 236
  - Nature Diversity Act 86
  - new technology development 85
  - North Sea and Skagerrak area plan 204
  - Norwegian Sea plan 204
  - offset projects 80
  - offshore oil and gas industry 73–4, 84, 86, 87, 204
  - permits 76, 79–80, 84–5, 236
  - Petroleum Act 72, 73–4, 204
  - Planning and Building Act 72–3, 76–80, 85, 204, 233

- plans for development and operation (PDO) and installation and operation (PIO) 74
- prescribed study programme, Svalbard 75–6
- prior notification for comment, Svalbard 75
- private sector and corporate sustainability practices 82–3
- public consultation 78, 79, 87–8, 208, 233, 234–6
- reindeer herding 77, 83, 85, 88, 207, 213
- salmon aquaculture 84, 87, 213
- Sami community 77, 83, 85, 88, 207
- scoping 77–8, 84–5, 87
- screening 76–7, 84
- significant environmental effect assessment 77, 82, 86, 233–4
- social impact assessment, lack of 82
- stakeholder involvement 77–8, 83, 87–8, 234–6
- sustainability focus 82–3, 84, 204, 218
- Svalbard Environmental Act (SEA) 72, 74–6, 83–4, 204, 233, 234, 235–6
- transboundary EIA 232–6, 289–94
- Water Resources and Energy Directorate 73
- wind parks 86–7
- Nuclear Safety and Control Act, Canada 107, 241
- Nunavut EIA legislation, Canada 111–13, 119, 216
- Nuuk Declaration, Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) 245–6
- Nuuk port expansion project, Greenland 164, 173, 179
- offshore oil and gas industry
  - Canada 107, 241
  - Greenland 164, 166–7, 169, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176–7
  - Norway 73–4, 84, 86, 87, 204
  - Russia 191
  - US 151, 154–5, 157–8, 213–14
- oil sands mining projects, Canada 124, 127, 128, 130–31, 206, 217, 259
- Olsen, E. 204
- Ongaro, E. 17, 19, 21–2
- Oscarsson, A. 239
- OSPAR Convention 166
- Overman, E. 15, 22, 23, 24
- Pålsson, B. 30
- peat industry, Finland 45, 48, 211
- Percival, R. 4
- permit process
  - Canada 109, 110, 113, 114, 122
  - Finland 38, 40–41, 43, 46–7
  - Greenland 165
  - Iceland 94, 96, 97
  - Norway 76, 79–80, 84–5, 236
  - Sweden 55–7, 67–8
  - US 142, 151, 152, 154, 157, 158, 159
  - see also* Final Report
- Pettersson, M. 30
- political status effects, Greenland 163, 172
- Pölönen, I. 30, 211, 231
- principle of knowledge, Sweden 64, 65–6, 215
- private governance innovations, Arctic EIA Guidelines 219–20
- private sector involvement
  - Finland 40
  - and future of EIA in Arctic 257–8
  - Greenland 172
  - Iceland 98, 101, 219
  - Norway 82–3
  - public–private partnerships (PPPs)
- production theory models, best practice research 17–18
- public consultation
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 203, 269–72, 273, 274
  - Canada 107, 109, 110, 112, 121–2, 123, 127, 129, 242, 245, 258
  - Canada, Alberta Province 121–2, 123, 127, 129, 258
  - Canada, Yukon Territory 121, 208
  - EIA questionnaire 279
  - Greenland 164, 165–6, 167–8, 169, 170, 177–8, 179
  - Iceland 96, 98, 100, 101, 102, 207, 212
  - Norway 78, 79, 87–8, 208, 233, 234–6

- public outreach strategies, Arctic EIA, future of 258
- Russia 185, 188–90, 196–8, 215
- Sweden 54, 60–61, 68–9, 70, 237, 239–40, 248, 251
- US 142, 143, 147–8, 149, 151, 156–8, 159, 160, 205, 258
- US, State of Alaska 157–8, 160
- see also* stakeholder involvement
- questionnaire 31, 277–9
- Rantakallio, S. 231
- Rautajoki, T. 67
- Ravna, O. 83
- regional environmental assessments 257, 259
- reindeer herding
  - Finland 42, 44–5, 46, 47, 49, 50–51, 206, 210, 212, 252, 258
  - Norway 77, 83, 85, 88, 207, 213
  - Sweden 61–3, 66, 252
- renewable energy projects *see* hydropower; wind power
- reverse engineering protocol, best practice research 21–2
- Rio Declaration on Environment and Development 6–7, 11, 225, 228
- Rose, R. 24
- Roura, R. 228
- Russia, federal EIA legislation 184–201
  - administrative guidance 195–6
  - alternatives consideration 185, 196, 198
  - best practices 196–8, 209
  - criticism of 215–16
  - declaration of intention 187–8, 215
  - Draft EIA and public comment period 196–7
  - economic globalization effects 199
  - engineering-ecological surveys 186, 191
  - Environmental Management Plan and Ecological Plan 209
  - Espoo Convention 184–5
  - expert reviewers 30
  - Federal Service for Supervision of Natural Resource Usage 191, 192
  - Final EIA and follow-up 197
  - funding limitations of public organizations 190, 195
  - and international standards 216
  - interviews 33, 287–8
  - land use planning, Russia 185–6, 188, 191, 195
  - offshore oil and gas industry 191
  - principle of potential danger to environment 184
  - project organizations 188, 209
  - public consultation 185, 188–90, 196–8, 215
  - public ecological expertise (PEE) 189–90, 195, 215
  - Regulation on the Assessment of Environmental Impact 185, 187, 192, 194
  - scoping 196
  - screening 196
  - Site Selection Act 188
  - social impact assessment 186, 187, 188, 198
  - stakeholder involvement 188, 197–8
  - state ecological expertise (SEE) review 185, 189, 190–92, 194–5
  - Town-Planning Code 185–6, 191, 195
- salmon aquaculture, Norway 84, 87, 213
  - see also* fishing
- Sami community
  - Finland EIA system 46, 248, 252
  - Norway, EIA legislation 77, 83, 85, 88, 207
  - Sweden, EIA legislation 57, 63, 64, 66, 69–70, 215
- Sami Council 274
- Saxe, S. 107
- scientific criticisms, best practice research 22–3
- scoping
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 263, 270
  - Canada 106, 110, 111, 116–17, 119–20, 126–7
  - Canada, Alberta Province 126–7
  - EIA questionnaire 278
  - Finland 36–7, 43–5, 229
  - Greenland 167, 168–9, 175–6, 177, 209, 214–15

- Iceland 94, 95, 100, 207
- Norway 77–8, 84–5, 87
- Russia 196
- Sweden 59–60, 66, 238
- US 144–8, 151, 156–8, 213
- screening
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 262
  - Canada 108–9, 112–13, 116–17, 119–20, 123, 126
  - Canada, Alberta Province 123, 126
  - EIA questionnaire 278
  - Finland 36, 37, 42–3
  - Greenland 167, 175
  - IAIA Principles 276
  - Iceland 93, 97
  - Norway 76–7, 84
  - Russia 196
  - Sweden 58–9, 65–6
  - US 146, 155–6
- Shadish, W. 23
- Sheate, W. 5
- Sjong, M. 233, 235, 236
- social impact assessment
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 203, 259
  - Canada 106–7, 108, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 120, 126, 130, 203, 207, 217, 258
  - Finland 49–51, 212
  - Greenland 165, 173–4, 178–80, 203, 209
  - Iceland 102, 212
  - Norway 82
  - Russia 186, 187, 188, 198
  - Sweden 66, 69–70
  - US 159, 210
  - see also* corporate social responsibility (CSR)
- Soneryd, L. 69
- Southcott, C. 1
- stakeholder involvement
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 203, 205–6, 208–9, 218–19
  - Canada, EIA systems 107, 109, 112, 121–2, 129, 131, 206, 208, 242, 244
  - EIA questionnaire 279
  - Finland EIA system 41, 45, 46, 48–51, 206, 208, 210, 211, 212, 248
  - Greenland 166, 170, 178–80
  - Iceland, EIA legislation 95–6, 101, 102
  - Norway, EIA legislation 77–8, 83, 87–8, 234–6
  - Russia, federal EIA legislation 188, 197–8
  - Sweden, EIA legislation 57–8, 65, 68–70, 206, 238, 248
  - US, EIA legislation 142, 143, 147, 149, 156, 209
  - see also* public consultation
- state ecological expertise (SEE) review,
  - Russia 185, 189, 190–92, 194–5
- Stepień, A. 1, 140, 257
- Stinson, J. 30
- Stoimenova, Y. 134, 241, 242
- sustainability focus 6–7, 12, 16, 257–8
  - Canada 121, 122
  - Greenland 165–6, 172, 173–4, 177, 178–9
  - Norway 82–3, 84, 204, 218
  - Sweden 56
  - US 161
- Svalbard Environmental Act (SEA),
  - Norway 72, 74–6, 83–4, 204, 233, 234, 235–6
- Sweden, EIA legislation 54–71
  - administrative guidance 64
  - alternatives, consideration of 239
  - appeal process 57, 59, 61
  - areas of national interest 55–6
  - army bases 63
  - baseline data availability 63, 65, 66–7
  - best practices 57–8, 64–70, 205, 206
  - communication preferences and north/south differences 63–4, 69–70
  - consultancy use 58, 64, 66
  - County Administrative Boards (CABs) 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 64, 67–8
  - criticism of 215
  - cumulative effects assessment 239
  - decentralized EIA process 55
  - developers and community contact 65, 66, 68–9
  - draft environmental impact statement 60, 66–7

- employment opportunities 63
- endangered species data 67
- Environmental Code 55–6, 215, 238–40, 248, 250, 251
- Environmental Ordinance 237, 238, 239–40
- Environmental Protection Act 54
- Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) 57, 59–60, 238, 240, 249, 250, 251–2
- and Espoo Convention 237–8, 239, 240, 249–50
- and EU EIA Directive 54, 237, 239
- EU Habitats Directive and Natura 2000 assessment 67
- expert reviewers 30
- final EIA and follow-up 67–8
- forestry 61–3
- hush money and indigenous peoples 69–70
- indigenous peoples 61–4, 66, 69–70
- international standards and best practices 67
- interviews 32, 281–2
- Kaunisvaara project 247–52
- knowledge dissemination to other countries 69
- land use planning 54, 55–6, 61–3, 69–70
- Lapland 61–3
- Minerals Act 56, 215
- mining concession-EIA 56–7, 215
- mining legislation and requirements 56–8, 68, 215
- mining operational conditions and Land and Environmental Courts submissions 57
- mitigation measures 68, 251–2
- monitoring requirements 67–8
- Natural Resources Act 54
- non-discrimination principle of Espoo Convention 238, 249
- permit requirement for environmentally hazardous activity 55–7, 67–8
- Planning and Building Act 54
- principle of knowledge 64, 65–6, 215
- public consultation 54, 60–61, 68–9, 70, 237, 239–40, 248, 251
- Regional Environmental Court 59
- reindeer herding 61–3, 66, 252
- Sami community 57, 63, 64, 66, 69–70, 215
- scoping 59–60, 66, 238
- screening 58–9, 65–6
- social impact assessments 66, 69–70
- socio-economic impacts 69–70
- stakeholder consultations 57–8, 65, 68–70, 206, 238, 248
- sustainability focus 56
- Swedish Road Administration and thresholds of impact significance 67
- transboundary EIA 236–40, 247–52, 289–94
- waste water discharge and biodegradation process 63
- wind power industry 68
- traditional knowledge 7, 11
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 203, 209–10, 272–3
  - berry picking, Finland 46, 212
  - Canada 113, 119, 129, 130, 132, 210, 216
  - EIA questionnaire 279
  - reindeer herding *see* reindeer herding
  - US, State of Alaska 152–4, 156–7, 206–7, 213
- transboundary EIA 223–56, 289–95
  - ‘affected state’ 227
  - Arctic EIA Guidelines 273–4
  - Arctic States as origin states 228–45, 246
  - Canada 240–45, 289–95
  - case study, Kaunisvaara project 247–52
  - due diligence principle 226–7, 228
  - evolution of 223–5
  - Finland 229–32, 247–52, 289–93
  - and global commons 227–8
  - guidance for Arctic 245–7
  - International Court of Justice (ICJ) rulings 225–7
  - and international law 225–8
  - monitoring issues 227
  - no-harm principle 225–7, 228
  - Norway 232–6, 289–94

- 'source state' 227
- Sweden 236–40, 247–52, 289–94
- and UN ECE Convention 273, 274
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) 2, 224
- US, EIA legislation 142–62
  - Administrative Record (AR) 155
  - alternatives, analysis of 148–9, 151, 158–9
  - appeal process 155, 214
  - baseline data 143, 158
  - best practices 155–9, 160, 205, 206–7, 209, 210
  - Categorical Exclusions (CEs) category 144–5
  - Clean Water Act 148–9
  - climate change considerations 158, 210, 213
  - consultancy use 156–7, 158
  - corporate social responsibility (CSR) 156
  - Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) 143, 150
  - criticism of 213–14
  - cumulative impacts 145, 149, 210
  - Draft EIS and 'Purpose and Need' statement 148–9, 150, 151, 158–9
  - Endangered Species Act 149, 157
  - Environmental Assessment (EA) category 145–6
  - Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) category 146, 147, 150
  - Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 146, 148, 149, 150–51, 205, 258
  - expert reviewers 30
  - federal legislation 142–5, 213
  - final decision (Record of Decision (ROD)) 143, 149, 151, 159
  - finding of no significant impact (FONSI) 145–6
  - interviews 32, 286–7
  - land use planning 142, 152, 154
  - lead agency responsibilities 144, 146, 148, 151, 155–6, 159
  - Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) 156
  - Minerals Management Service (MMS) 151, 213–14
  - mitigation measures 146, 149, 157–8, 159
  - monitoring 149, 159
  - National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 4, 142–3, 144, 149, 150–51, 154, 155, 205
  - National Historic Preservation Act 149
  - National Marine Fisheries Services' (NMFS) 151
  - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) 151
  - 'no action' alternative 148
  - North Slope Borough 154, 155
  - Notice of Availability 149, 151
  - Notice of Intent (NOI) publication 146, 151
  - OCS Lands Act 151
  - offshore oil and gas activities in Arctic Ocean 151, 154–5, 157–8, 213–14
  - permit process 142, 151, 152, 154, 157, 158, 159
  - potentially significant impacts 146, 147, 151, 158
  - public consultation 142, 143, 147–8, 149, 151, 156–8, 159, 160, 205, 258
  - review process 150–51
  - scoping 144–8, 151, 156–8, 213
  - screening 146, 155–6
  - social and cultural assessment requirement 159, 210
  - stakeholder involvement 142, 143, 147, 149, 156, 209
  - supplemental EIS 150
  - sustainability focus 161
  - US, EIA legislation, State of Alaska administrative guidance 154–5, 205
  - Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC) 157–8, 160
  - conflict avoidance agreements 156, 157–8
  - indigenous peoples 152–4, 156–8, 160
  - information and data sharing 158

- permit and lease departments 152
- public consultation 157–8, 160
- traditional ecological knowledge  
152–4, 156–7, 206–7, 213
- validity concerns, best practice research  
23
- Vesely, A. 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24
- visual impacts, Iceland 100–101, 219
  - see also* significant environmental  
impact assessment
- water
  - Clean Water Act, US 148–9
  - waste water discharge and  
biodegradation process, Sweden  
63
  - Water Resources and Energy  
Directorate, Norway 73
- Westergaard, N. 30
- whaling, US 157–8, 160
  - see also* fishing
- wildlife and adaptive management  
thresholds, Canada 120
- wind power
  - Finland 42, 44, 45, 46, 50, 217–18,  
258
  - Norway 86–7
  - Sweden 68
  - see also* energy regulation;  
hydropower
- Winter, J. 30
- Yang, T. 4
- Ylivainio, L. 30
- Yukon Territory *see* Canada, EIA  
systems, Yukon Territory EIA  
legislation