

## Table of Contents

	PAGE
<i>About the Authors</i> . . . . .	iii
<i>Preface</i> . . . . .	ix
<i>Table of Cases</i> . . . . .	xvii
<b>Chapter 1 Canada’s Impact Assessment Act: Constitutional at last?</b> . . . .	<b>1</b>
<i>Liane Langstaff, Stacy Porter &amp; Maggie Sainty</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	1
Background . . . . .	1
A brief history of the IAA. . . . .	1
Designating projects under the IAA. . . . .	2
IAA Process: Three Key Phases. . . . .	3
Constitutional Challenge to the IAA . . . . .	4
The Alberta Court of Appeal Reference decision . . . . .	4
The SCC Reference decision . . . . .	5
Amendments to the IAA . . . . .	9
Changes to definition of “federal effects”. . . . .	9
The federal government will likely give more consideration to the assessment processes of other jurisdictions, including provincial, territorial and Indigenous governments . . . . .	11
The screening phase has been amended; impact assessment will only be required if the Agency is satisfied that the project may cause “adverse effects within federal jurisdiction or direct or incidental adverse effects” (section 16 (2.1)). . . . .	12
The final project approval decision must consider whether effects are likely to be “to some extent significant” (sections 60-63) . . . . .	12
Potential Implications for Project Proponents . . . . .	13
Federal impact assessment is here to stay; although it will be constrained to exclusive federal effects . . . . .	13
Canada may more frequently substitute federal assessment with provincial, territorial or Indigenous assessments. . . . .	13
There will be more limited opportunities to consider cross-border GHGs and air pollution . . . . .	14
What’s Next for the IAA? . . . . .	14

**Chapter 2 Regulatory Certainty in the Environmental Assessment Process Can Be Preserved Before A Defined Project Design is Identified—The Example of the DNNP . . . . . 17**

*Stan Berger*

Introduction . . . . .	17
Background . . . . .	18
Assessing whether the BWRX-300 technology was Bounded by the Plant Parameter Envelope and whether revisions to that PPE were needed . . . . .	20
The fuel type-enriched versus natural uranium . . . . .	21
Cooling System -single loop no secondary cooling system . . . . .	22
Dealing with Design Characteristics Outside the Original Plant Parameter Envelop . . . . .	23
Main Parameters Outside the original PPE . . . . .	23
Increased Water Storage Driven by Revised Fire Code Standards . . . . .	23
Deeper Embedment . . . . .	23
Airborne Releases . . . . .	24
Radioactive Solid Waste . . . . .	24
Increased Spent Fuel Cask Weight . . . . .	24
Species at Risk—The Since Discovered Presence of Bats and a new Category of Species at Risk-Bank Swallows . . . . .	25
Multi-Reactor Accidents, Out of Core Criticality Accidents . . . . .	25
Were there Fundamental Differences Between the BWRX and the Technologies Assessed in the EA? . . . . .	25
First Nations' Concerns . . . . .	26
The Application of the Impact Assessment Act . . . . .	27
Concluding Thoughts . . . . .	28

**Chapter 3 Forevermore: The Increasing Regulation of and Expanding Liabilities for PFAS in Canada . . . . . 31**

*Richard King, Jennifer Fairfax, Evan J. Barz, and Alex Farrant*

Introduction . . . . .	31
Background: what are PFAS, and why are they regulated? . . . . .	32
Current regulatory framework in Canada and recent developments . . . . .	34
Federal . . . . .	34
Provincial . . . . .	40
Key takeaways and potential future developments . . . . .	41
Regulation of PFAS in Food, Cosmetics, and Other Products . . . . .	42
Contaminated Lands . . . . .	44
Workplace Regulation and Liabilities . . . . .	46
Civil Litigation and Class Proceedings . . . . .	47

Concluding Thoughts . . . . .	48
<b>Chapter 4 Québec Environmental Law Updates . . . . .</b>	<b>51</b>
<i>Martin Thiboutot</i>	
Continued implementation of environmental authorization scheme . . . . .	51
Contaminated soils: a royalty for excavated contaminated soils comes into effect, the traceability system's implementation continues, and the Ministry publishes a new guide for characterization work . . . . .	51
Water extraction: an increase in royalty rates and greater transparency . . . . .	53
Transitional regime for activities in bodies of water . . . . .	54
GHG cap-and-trade system . . . . .	55
Residual Materials: expanded deposit-refund system and revamped regime applicable to containers, packaging and printed matters . . . . .	55
Municipalities increasingly active in the environmental sphere . . . . .	56
Environmental performance of buildings . . . . .	57
Constitutional challenges at the federal level . . . . .	58
Mining and Energy: Significant changes are on the table . . . . .	59
<b>Chapter 5 Hedging an Uncertain Climate Future: The Role of Contracts for Differences in the Push for Innovative Low-Carbon Technologies . . . . .</b>	<b>63</b>
<i>Selina Lee-Andersen</i>	
A Call to Action . . . . .	63
De-risking to Innovate . . . . .	63
Canada Growth Fund . . . . .	64
The Secret Life of CfDs . . . . .	66
Current Applications of CfDs . . . . .	67
Key Contract Considerations . . . . .	69
CfDs in the Canadian Context . . . . .	71
CfDs as a Complementary Policy Tool . . . . .	73
The Path to Innovation . . . . .	75
<b>Chapter 6 Article Submission from Blakes — Sept. 4/24 . . . . .</b>	<b>77</b>
Minding Your Business: The State of Environmental Class Actions in Canada . . . . .	77
Climate-Change Litigation . . . . .	77
Climate-change proceedings against governments . . . . .	78
Private-law climate-change actions against industry . . . . .	81
Greenwashing Claims . . . . .	83
Securities and Public-Disclosure Violations . . . . .	84

PFAS Class Actions. . . . .	85
Strategies for Businesses. . . . .	86
<b>Chapter 7 Climate Change and Human Rights: the 2024 landmark Swiss KlimaSeniorinnen (Women for Climate Protection) ruling of the European Court of Human Rights. . . . .</b>	<b>89</b>
<i>Evelyne M. Ameye</i>	
The Swiss <i>KlimaSeniorinnen</i> case . . . . .	90
The Swiss <i>KlimaSeniorinnen</i> ruling is a judgment of the European Court of Human Rights. . . . .	93
The Swiss <i>KlimaSeniorinnen</i> case surmounted all procedural hurdles that commonly impede climate change litigation . . . . .	93
The Swiss <i>KlimaSeniorinnen</i> case surmounted the substantial hurdle of causality commonly impeding climate change litigation . . . . .	94
A comparison with Canada, where procedural and causality hurdles have so far impeded climate change litigation . . . . .	96
The Swiss <i>KlimaSeniorinnen</i> case opened the floodgates for more climate change litigation in Europe . . . . .	100
Conclusion. . . . .	102
<b>Chapter 8 Officer and Director Liability for Environmental Offences may not Require Proof of Knowledge of the Underlying Infraction: <i>R. v. Mossman</i>, 2024 BCSC 443. . . . .</b>	<b>105</b>
<i>Nicholas Hughes, Val Lucas, and Emma Walsh</i>	
Overview of Mr. Mossman's Convictions. . . . .	106
Secondary Liability Offences . . . . .	108
Inconsistent Approach? . . . . .	110
Additional Unique Aspect of Regulatory Crimes . . . . .	111
Key Takeaways . . . . .	111
<b>Chapter 9 Shutting the Open Door: B.C. Court of Appeal Overturns Contractor's Claim for Cost Recovery Under the <i>Environmental Management Act</i> . . . . .</b>	<b>113</b>
<i>Talia Gordner and Jamieson Virgin</i>	
Factual Background. . . . .	114
Supreme Court of British Columbia Decision . . . . .	114
Appeal Decision. . . . .	115
Implications for British Columbia and Elsewhere. . . . .	115
Key Takeaways . . . . .	117
Index . . . . .	119