DOI: https://doi.org/10.54083/978-81-980121-3-5_11

Chapter 11

Environmental Impact Assessments: Ensuring Sustainability

Preeti Maurya[1] and Anamika Akarsh[2]

[1]Dept. of Aquatic Environment Management, [2]Dept. of Fisheries Resource Management, Faculty of Fishery Sciences, West Bengal University of Animal & Fishery Sciences, Kolkata, West Bengal (700 094), India

Abstract

Sustainable development is more important than ever in a world where environmental issues like deforestation and climate change are causing problems. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) are critical in protecting the environment while facilitating economic progress. EIAs are an organised procedure that assesses the possible environmental impacts of proposed projects or policies, ensuring that development activities are sustainable and in line with ecological preservation. EIAs are a valuable tool for decision-makers because they detect, forecast and mitigate negative consequences, allowing them to reconcile human demands with environmental stewardship. In recent years, there has been a notable increase in interest in environmental concerns, particularly sustainability and improved development management in line with the environment. Environmental protection and sustainable development have long been essential to India's economic and developmental policies and practices. The ultimate purpose of an EIA is to promote responsible development that satisfies current requirements without jeopardising future generations' capacity to thrive, therefore contributing to a sustainable future.

Keywords EIA, Evaluation, Mitigation, Sustainability

1. Introduction

Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) are crucial instruments for determining the possible environmental repercussions of planned development projects before they are implemented (Momtaz and Kabir, 2018). By methodically examining how projects may impact ecosystems, water resources, air quality, biodiversity and human well-being. EIAs help identify potential negative impacts early in the planning process (Christensen

***Corresponding author's e-mail**: preetimaurya070297@gmail.com; akarshanamika@gmail.com

How to cite:

Maurya, P., Akarsh, A., 2025. Environmental impact assessments: Ensuring sustainability. In: *Aquaculture Reimagined: Modern Approaches to Sustainable Fish Farming*. (Eds.) Saini, V.P., Paul, T., Singh, A.K., Biswal, A. and Samanta, R. Biotica Publications, India. pp. 136-151. DOI: https://doi.org/10.54083/978-81-980121-3-5_11.

et al., 2005). This proactive approach not only mitigates environmental harm but also fosters sustainability by guiding developers, policymakers and stakeholders toward more environmentally responsible decisions (Sharma and Vredenburg, 1998). Through rigorous analysis and public consultation, EIAs ensure that economic growth and infrastructure development occur in harmony with ecological preservation, balancing human needs with the health of the planet for future generations (Glasson and Therivel, 2013).

EIA has evolved and altered throughout time, impacted by shifting decision-making demands and processes, as well as practice experience (Morgan, 1998). To better understand the impact of actions on people, communities and the natural environment, it's vital to evaluate past progress and anticipate future issues. The origins and evolution of EIA, as well as the present scope of EIA use, emerging kinds of impact assessment and situations in which EIA is used.

The second section examines recent trends in EIA philosophy, practice and efficacy. It concludes with a summary of the current state of EIA and options for shaping its future. EIA is taken to mean the broad process that emerged from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (NEPA) in the USA: it is used here as an umbrella term that captures the essential idea of assessing proposed actions (from policies to projects) for their likely implications for all aspects of the environment, before decisions are made to commit to those actions and developing appropriate responses to the issues identified in that assessment.

2. Origin and Development of EIA

Land-use planning, which was only in its most basic form before 1970, has been given a federal dimension in the United States by the EIA mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). This has led to a situation where decisions on significant federal activities can only be made with knowledge of their likely environmental effects. The speed at which state and municipal laws have mirrored these federal actions is a good indicator of their impact. Since then, a number of other developed nations have adopted EIA practices. For instance, in 1973, 1974, 1981 and 1984, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands and Japan all passed laws; however, after almost ten years of discussion, the European Community (EC) finally passed a directive in July 1985 requiring environmental assessments for specific project types (Sharma and Vredenburg, 1998).

Developed nations have not been the only ones to recognise the possibilities of EIA. In the lack of a formal land-use planning control structure, many less developed countries (LDCs) have quickly realised that the procedures provide a way to introduce certain parts of environmental planning. In Asia and the Pacific, Thailand and the Philippines have long-standing EIA processes, while Colombia became the first Latin American nation to have an EIA system when regulations were implemented in 1974. Though certain countries, such as Rwanda, Botswana and the Sudan, have experience with EIA, there is a lack of knowledge on the overall situation in Africa (Klennert, 1984).

3. Importance of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs)

3.1. Preventing Environmental Degradation

• Projects like dams, factories, highways, mining activities and urban growth may cause environmental impact, which is something that EIAs assist in identifying (Mandle and Tallis, 2016). Developers and legislators can prevent or lessen harm to ecosystems, water resources, air quality and biodiversity by carrying out an EIA early in the planning process (Tallis *et al.*, 2015).

• An EIA for a dam project, for instance, would evaluate how it will affect local residents, fish migration, river ecosystems and water quality. Early study can lead to design modifications that minimise environmental damage, including incorporating fish tunnels or preserving minimal water flow levels.

3.2. Sustainable Development

• By preventing economic expansion from compromising environmental or social well-being, EIAs advance the idea of sustainable development (Morrison-Saunders and Retief, 2012). Without sacrificing the capacity of future generations to meet their own requirements, the objective is to satisfy present development demands (Holden *et al.*, 2014). Before authorising a mining project, an EIA would look at ways to ensure long-term sustainability by minimising land damage, reducing water pollution from mining runoff and restoring ecosystems once the mine shuts.

3.3. Decision-Making Support for Governments and Regulators

• According to O'Faircheallaigh (2010), EIAs give governments, regulators and decision-makers the information they need to decide whether to accept, alter or reject projects depending on their possible environmental effect. EIAs assist in ensuring that environmental factors are incorporated into the planning process by providing a methodical, scientific approach (Slocombe, 1993).

• A project may be denied or modified if its EIA reveals significant environmental risks, such as the destruction of critical habitats or contamination of drinking water sources (Geneletti, 2002).

3.4. Public Participation and Transparency

• The EIA process's emphasis on transparency and public engagement is one of its advantages (Hasan *et al.*, 2018). Input on the project and its possible effects are frequently solicited from communities, stakeholders and interest groups. This guarantees that social and environmental issues are taken into account and permits a wider variety of viewpoints (Reed, 2008).

• When a highway project crosses vulnerable ecosystems or indigenous territory, local people, environmental organisations and other stakeholders would be consulted as part of the EIA. Their suggestions can assist in forming the project in ways that accommodate community concerns and lessen adverse effects (Baker and Westman, 2018).

3.5. Mitigation Measures

• EIAs provide ways to lessen a project's detrimental effects on the environment. This might involve tactics like habitat restoration, pollution control technology or compensation schemes for populations who have been displaced. These steps guarantee that the project is carried out in a way that is more socially and ecologically responsible (Frihy, 2001).

• A coastal development project may suggest constructing artificial reefs to promote marine biodiversity, planting mangroves to restore coastal ecosystems or erecting protective barriers to lessen erosion.

3.6. Monitoring and Compliance

• Project approval does not mark the conclusion of an EIA. It also contains clauses for tracking the project's environmental effects over time to make sure rules are followed and mitigation strategies are carried out correctly. According to Wong and Zhou (2015), this continuous monitoring is essential for adjusting to unanticipated environmental impacts.

• For example, to prove adherence to environmental regulations, a mining business could be expected to provide frequent reports on its air emissions, waste disposal and water use.

4. Challenges in Implementing EIAs

4.1. Weak Regulatory Frameworks

• Some nations have weak or inconsistent EIA regulations, which results in insufficient evaluations or a failure to implement mitigation strategies. By permitting ecologically harmful projects to move forward with little inspection, this can defeat the goal of the EIA (Panigrahi and Amirapu, 2012).

4.2. Inadequate Public Participation

• Although it is a fundamental tenet of EIAs, public consultation can occasionally be tokenistic or restricted. According to Sandham and Chabalala (2019), marginalised groups, such rural people or indigenous communities, would not have enough access to the EIA process, which would restrict their capacity to influence choices that impact their lives and environment.

4.3. Project Bias

• Sometimes, especially if they get funding from the project developers, the organisations performing EIAs may be biassed in favour of project approval. As a result, EIAs may overstate the efficacy of mitigation strategies or minimise adverse effects (Li, 2009).

4.4. Insufficient Monitoring

• Even when an EIA is conducted thoroughly, there may be insufficient monitoring of the project's environmental impacts during and after construction (Frihy, 2001).

• Without regular monitoring and compliance checks, projects can fail to meet environmental standards, causing long-term harm.

5. Evaluating Impacts: Comprehensive Methods and Approaches in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

A crucial procedure for anticipating, assessing and reducing the possible environmental effects of development projects, plans, or policies prior to their implementation (Wathern, 1995). It gives stakeholders, developers and decision-makers a methodical way to make sure that the environmental effects of suggested actions are recognised and that precautions are taken to reduce adverse effects.

5.1. Project Description

• The proposed project's location, size, design, technology to be employed and goals are all covered in depth at the outset of the EIA (Ogola, 2007). A detailed overview of the project's objectives and operational scope is given in this section.

5.2. Baseline Environmental Conditions

• Evaluating the project area's baseline conditions, such as the current state of the air and water, animals, vegetation, soil and local populations, is a crucial component of the EIA. When assessing possible environmental changes and repercussions, this data is used as a guide (Saeed *et al.*, 2012).

• For example, if an industrial project is proposed near a river, hydropower project, the baseline study would include water quality measurements, aquatic life assessments and community reliance on the river for livelihoods.

5.3. Identification and Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

• Finding the project's possible positive and negative environmental effects is the main goal of the EIA. This entails evaluating both immediate and long-term impacts on local residents, animals, ecosystems and the quality of the air and water (Cooplestone *et al.*, 2001). Impacts are usually classified by chance of occurrence and intensity (small, moderate or severe).

• For example, in the case of a large-scale agricultural project, the EIA would assess the effects of irrigation, possible soil erosion and pesticide runoff on local water supplies.

5.4. Checklists and Matrices: Systematic Identification of Impacts

• EIA frequently uses checklists and matrices to methodically find possible environmental consequences related to a project (Canter and Kamath, 1995).

• A checklist usually includes a comprehensive list of environmental elements that the project may impact, including biodiversity, noise, air quality, water resources and socioeconomic considerations. The project team goes through each factor to check whether it might be impacted.

• A more advanced approach is the use of matrices, which cross-reference specific project activities with environmental components, helping to visualize how each aspect of the project (*e.g.*, excavation, waste disposal, transportation) affects different environmental factors (Fewings and Hengewele, 2019).

• For example, a matrix can illustrate how the construction phase of a road might impact local water bodies through runoff or soil erosion, helping project planners prioritize key areas for mitigation.

5.5. Geographical Information Systems (GIS): Spatial Analysis and Impact Mapping

• GIS is a powerful tool for spatial analysis in EIAs, allowing for the visualization and interpretation of environmental data in relation to geographical locations (Campo, 2012).

• It provides a clear, map-based representation of how different environmental elements interact with the project site and surrounding areas.

• According to Dale *et al.* (1998), GIS is especially helpful for determining the geographical extent of consequences such pollution dispersion, habitat fragmentation and changes in land use. For instance, in an industrial project, GIS may be used to map sensitive ecosystems, such as protected areas or wetlands and assess the potential impacts of the project's footprint. This method enables more precise planning and the identification of areas requiring stricter environmental safeguards.

5.6. Modelling and Simulation: Predicting Future Environmental Conditions

• Environmental modelling is essential for predicting future impacts that cannot be directly observed, such as air or water pollution, noise levels, or climate-related changes (Noyes and Lema, 2015).

• Models use mathematical equations and algorithms to simulate how pollutants will disperse or accumulate over time (Parra-Guevara and Skiba, 2003).

• For instance, hydrological models can estimate how construction activities will affect water flow, sediment transport and flood risks in river systems. These simulations provide critical insights into both short-term and long-term environmental changes, enabling proactive mitigation measures.

5.7. Consideration of Alternatives

• A thorough EIA will look at other project choices, such as new locations, technologies, or designs that could accomplish the same objectives with less of an impact on the environment. This guarantees that a variety of solutions that take into account both environmental sustainability and economic viability are available to the decision-makers (Therivel, 1993).

• A renewable energy project may, evaluate several wind farm locations, weighing their effects on local ecosystems, bird migration and closeness to populated areas.

5.8. Mitigation Strategies

• Following the identification of possible effects, the EIA suggests mitigation techniques to prevent, lessen or offset these effects. Redesigning project components, using cleaner technology, repairing impacted ecosystems or compensating impacted populations are some examples of mitigation (Bronner *et al.*, 2013). When building an industrial facility, mitigation strategies could include restoring plants to stop soil erosion, putting in place water recycling programs and installing cutting-edge air filtering systems.

5.9. Environmental Management Plan (EMP)

• The project's monitoring, management and adaptation strategies are described in the Environmental Management Plan, which is part of the EIA. The EMP ensures that mitigation measures are implemented and that environmental impacts are kept within acceptable limits (Steger, 2000).

• The EMP for a road construction project, for instance, might include noise monitoring during construction, dust suppression measures and ongoing assessments of wildlife crossings.

5.10. Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA): Weighing Environmental and Economic Outcomes

• A technique for estimating the economic worth of a project's advantages as well as any possible environmental harm is cost-benefit analysis (Atkinson and Mourato, 2008). It weighs the potential costs of environmental degradation (such as loss of ecosystem services, pollution cleanup and health effects on communities) against the project's financial benefits (such as job creation, infrastructural upgrades and economic growth). Decision-makers can determine if a project's social and economic benefits outweigh its environmental hazards (Volden, 2019).

5.11. Risk Assessment: Understanding Environmental Hazards

• The probability and seriousness of any environmental risks connected to a project are assessed using risk assessment techniques (Gul and Ak, 2018). High-risk factors are identified by this technique, including chemical contamination, hazardous material accidents and heightened susceptibility to natural disasters (Van Western, 2013). Risk assessments, can examine the likelihood of storm surges or floods made worse by sea level rise, as well as the possible harm to local ecosystems and infrastructure in a coastal development project.

• By identifying these risks early, the EIA process can integrate disaster resilience and mitigation measures into the project design.

6. Approaches in EIA

6.1. Scoping: Focusing on Key Environmental Issues

• The first steps in the EIA process are scoping, when the main environmental concerns to be looked at are determined (Kennedy and Ross, 1992).

• For instance, scoping is an essential early stage of an aquatic project, such building a hydroelectric dam. In order to concentrate the evaluation on the most important effects the project may have on the aquatic environment and nearby ecosystems, important environmental issues and concerns are identified during scoping.

• Efficient scoping helps focus resources on the areas of most concern and expedites the EIA process (Loomes *et al.*, 2021).

6.2. Mitigation Hierarchy: Reducing and Managing Impacts

The mitigation hierarchy is a guiding principle in EIA, designed to avoid or minimize environmental harm (Macintosh and Waugh, 2014). It follows a sequence of actions:

• *Avoidance*: Modifying a project's design to prevent major effects (such as rerouting a road to avoid a sensitive wetland).

• *Minimisation*: When avoidance is not an option, steps are taken to lessen the effects (*e.g.*, employing noise barriers during building).

• *Restoration*: Restoring ecosystems following the conclusion of a project, such as by replacing native plants.

• *Compensation (Offsetting)*: To make up for environmental loss when consequences cannot be avoided, compensating actions are taken, such as establishing new habitats.

6.3. Cumulative Impact Assessment: Addressing Combined and Long-Term Effects

• According to Gunn and Nobel (2009), cumulative impact assessment examines the cumulative impacts of several projects or activities across time in an area. Rather than assessing a project in isolation, this approach considers how the addition of a new development may contribute to or exacerbate existing environmental pressures (Matos and Hall, 2007).

• In an area with several industrial facilities, the cumulative assessment may examine how the emissions from the new project would increase the levels of pollution already present, possibly pushing the ecosystem over a sustainable threshold.

6.4. Adaptive Management: Flexibility for Ongoing Environmental Monitoring

• When ongoing project monitoring is required or when the long-term effects are unknown, adaptive management is employed (McLain and Lee, 1996).

• This method enables modifications to be made in response to current environmental data as the project is being implemented.

• For example, adaptive management would enable quick adjustments to logging methods in a forestry project if continuous monitoring shows that logging operations are resulting in unanticipated habitat loss, guaranteeing that environmental goals are still fulfilled.

7. Mitigation Strategies: Reducing Environmental Footprints

According to Jay *et al.* (2007), mitigation techniques are crucial instruments in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process that are intended to lessen or completely eradicate the negative environmental consequences of development projects. Through the implementation of these tactics, developers may reduce their environmental impact, preserving ecosystems, biodiversity and human health and welfare. In order to meet the demands of both the current and future generations, the main objective is to strike a balance between environmental sustainability and economic development.

7.1. Avoidance: Preventing Environmental Harm

The most effective mitigation strategy is to avoid causing environmental harm from the outset. This involves modifying project plans or choosing alternative locations or methods that prevent any impact on sensitive environments (Jones, 2001).

Rerouting roads away from animal corridors or delicate ecosystems, for instance, can avoid habitat degradation and fragmentation during road building operations. The preservation of vital ecosystems and biodiversity is also guaranteed when energy projects are planned to avoid wetlands or protected regions.

7.2. Minimization: Reducing the Severity of Impacts

Minimising the severity of environmental repercussions is the next best course of action when avoidance is not feasible. To cut emissions, waste and resource consumption, this entails changing the design, deploying cleaner technology or using best management practices (Tseng *et al.*, 2013). Scrubbers and filters are examples of pollution control technology that may be used to minimise emissions in industrial projects. By stabilising disturbed soil and preventing sediment discharge into water bodies, silt barriers, terracing and plant cover can reduce soil erosion in construction projects.

7.3. Restoration: Rehabilitating Affected Environments

In restoration, ecosystems that have been harmed by project operations are repaired (Hobbs and Harris, 2001). The goal of restoration efforts is to get the environment as close to its initial state as feasible when a project's development or operation is finished. Restoring wetlands, replacing native plants or repairing wildlife habitats that were momentarily disrupted are a few examples of this.

To restore biodiversity and ecosystem services, for instance, restoration in mining projects may entail modifying the area, restoring topsoil and planting native species.

7.4. Compensation (Offsetting): Balancing Unavoidable Impacts

Compensation or environmental offsetting, is used when significant environmental impacts cannot be entirely avoided or minimized. In such situations, developers build, restore or improve natural resources elsewhere to make up for these effects (Quétier and Lavorel, 2011).

For instance, if a building project destroys a wetland, the developer may rehabilitate a damaged wetland nearby or establish a new one. Even if the original location is changed, our approach guarantees that there is no net loss of ecosystem functions. Community advantages like financing conservation programs or assisting with regional environmental projects are often included in compensation.

7.5. Technological Innovation: Cleaner and Greener Solutions

Technological developments offer effective instruments for lowering a project's environmental impact. Project design is progressively using innovations in resource efficiency, waste management and renewable energy to reduce effects (Ding, 2008).

In energy projects, solar panels and wind turbines drastically cut greenhouse gas emissions by reducing dependency on fossil fuels. Precision farming methods reduce runoff and conserve resources in agriculture by optimising the use of fertiliser and water.

7.6. Sustainable Resource Management: Optimizing Use and Reducing Waste

According to Ekins *et al.* (2016), sustainable resource management seeks to minimise waste production, increase efficiency and decrease the use of natural resources. To lessen a project's total environmental impact, this tactic may involve the use of recycled materials, water-saving technology and energy-efficient systems.

For instance, using recycled building materials lowers the need for virgin resources in the construction sector and putting energy-efficient building designs into place reduces the amount of energy used for operations. Water shortage may be avoided in residential and commercial projects by implementing water conservation techniques including rainwater collection and grey water recycling.

7.7. Biodiversity Conservation: Protecting and Enhancing Ecosystems

Protecting species and their habitats from the adverse consequences of development is the main goal of biodiversity mitigation measures. This involves actions like establishing bird-friendly infrastructure (like wind turbines or power lines), establishing wildlife corridors to enable safe animal migration across fragmented landscapes and carrying out pre-construction studies to identify and safeguard endangered species. In densely populated places, including parks, green spaces and urban forests into project designs can improve biodiversity and provide animal habitats (Niemela *et al.*, 2010).

7.8. Ecosystem-Based Approaches: Leveraging Natural Processes

Ecosystem-based strategies reduce environmental effects by using natural processes, frequently offering long-term, affordable solutions.

Wetlands, forests and green roofs are examples of green infrastructure that may be utilised to control stormwater runoff, enhance air quality and offer animal habitat. Nature-based solutions, such as rehabilitating coral reefs and mangroves, improve biodiversity and sustain fisheries while shielding shorelines from erosion and storm surges in coastal areas. These tactics take use of ecosystems resilience to offer a variety of social, economic and environmental advantages.

7.9. Monitoring and Adaptive Management: Continuous Improvement

An essential component of mitigation is environmental monitoring, which makes sure that the success of tactics put into place is monitored over time. Project managers can identify unanticipated environmental consequences or changes in environmental circumstances, such as unexpected pollutant levels or animal disturbances, by continuously collecting and analysing data (MacDonald, 2000).

Adaptive management enables modifications to project operations or mitigation strategies to guarantee environmental protection in the event that adverse effects are detected. This flexibility is especially important in complex projects where environmental conditions may evolve or where initial predictions were uncertain.

8. Case Examples of Effective Mitigation Strategies

8.1. Hydroelectric Dam Projects and Fish Migration

The hydroelectric dams provide a large amount of the power in the area. But these dams also prevent salmon and other fish species from travelling between freshwater breeding areas and the ocean, which leads to sharp drops in populations.

By swimming upstream via a sequence of tiered ponds, these devices enable fish to progressively avoid the dam. To aid salmon in avoiding the dams, fish ladders were erected.

8.2. Wind Energy Projects and Wildlife

Bat and bird populations may be significantly impacted by wind farms, especially if they collide with the turbine blades. Developers have implemented tactics like careful site selection to steer clear of important ecosystems or migratory routes in order to lessen these effects. Modifying turbine operating schedules to prevent turbines from operating during periods of high migration. Setting up ultrasonic deterrents to prevent bats from approaching turbines.

8.3. Sustainable Urban Development

Mitigation measures in urban areas concentrate on lowering urban heat islands, controlling stormwater and enhancing air quality. Energy-efficient materials, green roofs and rainwater harvesting systems are examples of green construction technologies that help cut down on pollution and resource use. Because they cool the environment and provide urban animals a place to live, urban forests and green areas help create climate resilience.

8.4. Mining and Post-Project Rehabilitation

Significant habitat damage and land disruption are common features of mining ventures. Many businesses have responded by including restoration initiatives into their project lifecycles. This might entail repairing watercourses, growing native plants and shaping the terrain to its original state. To make sure ecosystems recover over time, several initiatives also set up long-term biodiversity monitoring programs.

9. EIAs as a Pathway to Sustainability

Environmental Impact Assessments are essential tools for directing development initiatives towards long-term results. EIAs provide a methodical way to assess the possible environmental, social and economic effects of proposed projects as human activity puts more and more demand on natural ecosystems. EIAs guarantee that development is balanced with ecological preservation, resource conservation and social equality by detecting and reducing adverse effects before they materialise. Because it incorporates environmental factors into decision-making, promotes stakeholder engagement and encourages adaptive management to handle new issues, this method enhances long-term sustainability (Armitage *et al.*, 2008). In the end, EIAs open the door for growth that satisfies current demands without endangering the prosperity of future generations.

10. Conclusion

Environmental impact assessments are an effective way to encourage sustainability since they make sure that projects' effects on the environment are thoroughly thought out before moving forward. Strong legislative frameworks, significant public involvement and continuous monitoring are necessary for EIAs to be really successful, nevertheless, in order to guarantee that the short and long-term environmental effects of development are appropriately handled. By striking a balance between environmental preservation and social and economic objectives, EIA promotes sustainable development. In order to ensure that development and progress take place in harmony with the natural world, mitigation methods are crucial in lowering the environmental impact of development initiatives. EIAs will remain essential in making sure that growth paths are resilient, sustainable and adaptive for coming generations as the globe deals with escalating environmental issues including biodiversity loss and climate change.

11. References

Armitage, D.R., Plummer, R., Berkes, F., Arthur, R.I., Charles, A.T., Davidson-Hunt, I.J., Diduck, A.P., Doubleday, N.C., Johnson, D.S., Marschke, M., McConney, P., 2009. Adaptive co-management for social-ecological complexity. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 7(2), 95-102.

Atkinson, G., Mourato, S., 2008. Environmental cost-benefit analysis. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 33(1), 317-344.

Baker, J.M., Westman, C.N., 2018. Extracting knowledge: Social science, environmental impact assessment and Indigenous consultation in the oil sands of Alberta, Canada. *The Extractive Industries and Society* 5(1), 144-153.

Bronner, C.E., Bartlett, A.M., Whiteway, S.L., Lambert, D.C., Bennett, S.J., Rabideau, A.J., 2013. An assessment of US stream compensatory mitigation policy: necessary changes to protect ecosystem functions and services. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 49(2), 449-462.

Campo, A.G.D., 2012. GIS in environmental assessment: a review of current issues and future needs. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management* 14(01), 1250007.

Canter, L.W., Kamath, J., 1995. Questionnaire checklist for cumulative impacts. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 15(4), 311-339.

Christensen, P., Kørnøv, L., Nielsen, E.H., 2005. EIA as regulation: does it work? *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 48(3), 393-412.

Dale, V.H., King, A.W., Mann, L.K., Washington-Allen, R.A., McCord, R.A., 1998. Assessing land-use impacts on natural resources. *Environmental Management* 22(2), 203-211.

Ding, G.K., 2008. Sustainable construction - The role of environmental assessment tools. *Journal of Environmental Management* 86(3), 451-464.

Ekins, P., Hughes, N., Brigenzu, S., Arden Clark, C., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Graedel, T., Hajer, M., Hashimoto, S., Hatfield-Dodds, S., Havlik, P., Hertwich, E., 2016. Resource efficiency: Potential and economic implications. pp. 12-30.

Fewings, P., Henjewele, C., 2019. *Construction Project Management: An Integrated Approach*. Routledge, London, UK. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1201/9781351122030.

Frihy, O.E., 2001. The necessity of environmental impact assessment (EIA) in implementing coastal projects: lessons learned from the Egyptian Mediterranean Coast. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 44(7-8), 489-516.

Geneletti, D., 2002. Ecological evaluation for environmental impact assessment.

Glasson, J., Therivel, R., 2013. *Introduction to Environmental Impact Assessment*. Routledge, London, UK. pp. 15-43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315881218.

Gul, M., Ak, M.F., 2018. A comparative outline for quantifying risk ratings in occupational health and safety risk assessment. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 196, 653-664.

Gunn, J.H., Noble, B.F., 2009. Integrating cumulative effects in regional strategic environmental assessment frameworks: lessons from practice. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management* 11(03), 267-290.

Hasan, M.A., Nahiduzzaman, K.M., Aldosary, A.S., 2018. Public participation in EIA: A comparative study of the projects run by government and non-governmental organizations. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 72, 12-24.

Hobbs, R.J., Harris, J.A., 2001. Restoration ecology: Repairing the earth's ecosystems in the new millennium. *Restoration Ecology* 9(2), 239-246.

Holden, E., Linnerud, K., Banister, D., 2014. Sustainable development: Our common future revisited. *Global Environmental Change* 26, 130-139.

Jay, S., Jones, C., Slinn, P., Wood, C., 2007. Environmental impact assessment: Retrospect and prospect. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 27(4), 287-300.

Jones, R.N., 2001. An environmental risk assessment/ management framework for climate change impact assessments. *Natural Hazards* 23(2), 197-230.

Kennedy, A.J., Ross, W.A., 1992. An approach to integrate impact scoping with environmental impact assessment. *Environmental Management* 16, 475-484.

Klennert, K., 1984. Environmental impact assessment (EIA) for development. In: *Proceedings of a Joint DSE/ UNEP International Seminar*, Feldafing/ Federal Republic of Germany April 9-12, 1984. p. 377.

Li, F., 2009. Documenting accountability: environmental impact assessment in a Peruvian mining project. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 32(2), 218-236.

Loomis, J.J., De Oliveira, C.M.R., Dziedzic, M., 2021. Environmental federalism in EIA policy: A comparative case study of Paraná, Brazil and California, US. *Environmental Science & Policy* 122, 75-82.

MacDonald, L.H., 2000. Evaluating and managing cumulative effects: process and constraints. *Environmental management* 26, 299-315.

Macintosh, A., Waugh, L., 2014. Compensatory mitigation and screening rules in environmental impact assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 49, 1-12.

Mandle, L., Tallis, H., 2016. Spatial ecosystem service analysis for environmental impact assessment of projects. In: *Handbook on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Impact Assessment*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, United Kingdom. pp. 15-40.

Matos, S., Hall, J., 2007. Integrating sustainable development in the supply chain: The case of life cycle assessment in oil and gas and agricultural biotechnology. *Journal of Operations Management* 25(6), 1083-1102.

McLain, R.J., Lee, R.G., 1996. Adaptive management: Promises and pitfalls. *Environmental Management* 20, 437-448.

Momtaz, S., Kabir, Z., 2018. *Evaluating Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in Developing Countries*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands. pp. 7-23.

Morgan, R.K., 1998. *Environmental Impact Assessment: A Methodological Perspective*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, Massachusetts, USA. pp. 1-48.

Morrison-Saunders, A., Retief, F., 2012. Walking the sustainability assessment talk - Progressing the practice of environmental impact assessment (EIA). *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 36, 34-41.

Niemelä, J., Saarela, S.R., Söderman, T., Kopperoinen, L., Yli-Pelkonen, V., Väre, S., Kotze, D.J., 2010. Using the ecosystem services approach for better planning and conservation of urban green spaces: a Finland case study. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 19, 3225-3243.

Noyes, P.D., Lema, S.C., 2015. Forecasting the impacts of chemical pollution and climate change interactions on the health of wildlife. *Current Zoology* 61(4), 669-689.

O'Faircheallaigh, C., 2010. Public participation and environmental impact assessment: Purposes, implications and lessons for public policy making. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 30(1), 19-27.

Ogola, P.F.A., 2007. Environmental impact assessment general procedures. In: *Proceedings of the Short Course II on Surface Exploration for Geothermal Resources*, organized by UNUGTP and KenGen, at Lake Naivasha, Kenya, November 2-17. pp. 1-16.

Panigrahi, J.K., Amirapu, S., 2012. RETRACTED: An assessment of EIA system in India. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 35, 23-36.

Parra-Guevara, D., Skiba, Y.N., 2003. Elements of the mathematical modeling in the control of pollutants emissions. *Ecological Modelling* 167(3), 263-275.

Quétier, F., Lavorel, S., 2011. Assessing ecological equivalence in biodiversity offset schemes: Key issues and solutions. *Biological Conservation* 144(12), 2991-2999.

Reed, M.S. 2008. Stakeholder participation for environmental management: a literature review. *Biological Conservation* 141(10), 2417-2431.

Saeed, R., Sattar, A., Iqbal, Z., Imran, M., Nadeem, R., 2012. Environmental impact assessment (EIA): an overlooked instrument for sustainable development in Pakistan. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 184, 1909-1919.

Sandham, L.A., Chabalala, J.J., Spaling, H.H., 2019. Participatory rural appraisal approaches for public participation in EIA: Lessons from South Africa. *Land* 8(10), 150.

Sharma, S., Vredenburg, H., 1998. Proactive corporate environmental strategy and the development of competitively valuable organizational capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal* 19(8), 729-753.

Slocombe, D.S., 1993. Environmental planning, ecosystem science and ecosystem approaches for integrating environment and development. *Environmental Management* 17, 289-303.

Steger, U. 2000. Environmental management systems: Empirical evidence and further perspectives. *European Management Journal* 18(1), 23-37.

Tallis, H., Kennedy, C.M., Ruckelshaus, M., Goldstein, J., Kiesecker, J.M., 2015. Mitigation for one & all: An integrated framework for mitigation of development impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 55, 21-34.

Therivel, R., 1993. Systems of strategic environmental assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 13(3), 145-168.

Tseng, M.L., Tan, R.R., Siriban-Manalang, A.B., 2013. Sustainable consumption and production for Asia: sustainability through green design and practice. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 40, 1-5.

Van Westen, C.J., 2013. Remote sensing and GIS for natural hazards assessment and disaster risk management. *Treatise on Geomorphology* 3(15), 259-298.

Volden, G.H., 2019. Assessing public projects' value for money: An empirical study of the usefulness of cost-benefit analyses in decision-making. *International Journal of Project Management* 37(4), 549-564.

Wathern, P., 1995. *Environmental Impact Assessment*. Routledge, London, UK. pp. 129-142.

Wong, J.K.W., Zhou, J., 2015. Enhancing environmental sustainability over building life cycles through green BIM: A review. *Automation in Construction* 57, 156-165.