

MYTHS

Myth 1:

Integration means more *effective* influence of the assessment on the final decision.

Myth 2:

More knowledge leads to *better planned* decisions.

MYTHS

Myths cover up the fact, that the integrative approach is counterproductive to two other major aims with EIA/SEA:

1) to create transparency in assessment and decision-making,

2) to open up for public participation.

SUSTAINABILITY APPROACH

Balancing of effects will be made in-between:

-pros and cons environmental effects

-pros and cons social effects

-pros and cons economic effects

RATIONALITY APPROACH **(communicative reflection):**

Integrated rationalities should be:

-cognitive-instrumental rationality

-ethical rationality

-esthetical rationality

SUSTAINABILITY

optimising environmental care

- Objectives defined beforehand by the developer or the administration/planners
- Alternatives that realise/implement the objectives with optimal environmental care are chosen
- The environment becomes *a means*
- The process will be goal-directed

RATIONALITY

optimising environmental care

- Objectives and means are free to be chosen in the process
- Alternatives that optimise environmental care decide the means
- The environment becomes a *value* to be protected
- The process will seek objectives or homing

CONCLUSION

- 1) Public participation in a) the identification of objectives for the project, plan or programme, b) the scope for assessment, and c) the assessment itself.
- 2) Separate the assessment process from the decision-making process.
- 3) No balancing – outline all effects, conflicts and interests.
- 4) Let the politicians make the final decision. There should be no doubt about the ownership of the decision.