Appendix 2.2B
Transmission Line Alternatives
Presentation Notes
New Gold Draft Notes from October 1, 2013 Meeting with MOE and MFLNRO Regarding Transmission Corridor Options

MFLNRO suggested Greer Creek Option
Why couldn’t New Gold follow the Kluskus FSR with the transmission line north to about Greer Creek and then traverse westward over country to link in to where the current Option 3b alignment is shown?

New Gold Response
This alignment was considered as part of our trade off study and noted as option 9 and drawn on the attached map. From the tradeoff study we noted the alignment is much longer (15 % longer), requiring an additional 20 km of line and incurring more cost and more disturbance, approximately 80 ha more clearing than the alignment proposed. Further this route would incur more private land crossing north of Greer Creek. Hence the proposed alignment was chosen and work to follow existing disturbance (~65 % on existing disturbance areas).

MFLNRO suggested Holy Cross Option
Follow Kluskus FSR north to Holy Cross south from Nithi River for as long as possible, and cross the Nechako further west than the proposed Option 3b and rejoin it around Big Bend Creek.

New Gold Response
We looked at that option. In comparison to our proposed route [3b]

• The re-route would result in an increased line length of approximately 3.6km with associated costs
• There would be significant logistical constraints by following the Holy Cross FSR due to regular heavy logging traffic
• Additional environmental effects will be realized due the increased line length (3.6 km x 40m)
• Impacts to recreational values surrounding the Nechako Reservoir and private land would need to be addressed (the alignment to get to the would run east-west north of the reservoir)

Route 3b is shown on the attached figure.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

New Gold Inc. (New Gold) retained AMEC Environment & Infrastructure (AMEC) to conduct environmental services for the proposed Blackwater Gold Project (proposed Project), located approximately 110 km south of Vanderhoof, British Columbia (BC). The proposed Project will include the construction of an electrical transmission line required to power the proposed Blackwater mine. AMEC provided environmental and social input for the assessment of alternatives for the alignment of the transmission line.

2.0 SIX TRANSMISSION LINE ALTERNATIVES

Knight Piésold developed five alternative transmission line alignments (Figure 2-1) with a sixth option, which follows Option 3 but with different voltage:

- Option 1 – This ROW runs south and then west from the TAC Substation for approximately 135 km to the proposed Project, following existing logging roads and disturbances where possible. Approximately 11.4 km of this alignment would cross private property near Vanderhoof;

- Option 2 – Interconnection with BC Hydro 230 kV system would be achieved through a new substation located on line 2L353 to the west of Vanderhoof BC. This ROW runs south approximately 112 km to the proposed Project, following existing logging roads and disturbances where possible. Approximately 5.3 km of this alignment would cross private property near Vanderhoof;

- Option 3 – Interconnection would be at the Glennanon (GLN) Substation near Fraser Lake to BC Hydro’s 230 kV system. This ROW runs east from the GLN Substation for approximately 19 km and continues south for another 114 km, following existing logging roads and disturbances to the Project where possible;
• Option 3A – Interconnection would be at the GLN Substation near Fraser Lake to BC Hydro’s 138 kV system. This alignment follows the same ROW as Alternative 3;

• Option 4 – Interconnection with BC Hydro 230 kV system would be achieved through a new substation located on line 2L353 approximately 6 km to the west of the Alternative 2 proposed interconnection site. This ROW runs south approximately 114 km to the proposed Project, following existing logging roads and disturbances where possible and would avoid private parcels that are potentially affected by Alternative 2 described above; and

• Option 5 – The ROW was identified during the PEA update study as an alternative that would avoid private parcels that are potentially affected by Alternative 2 described above. Interconnection with BC Hydro 230 kV system would be achieved through a new substation located on line 2L353 approximately 17 km to the west of the Alternative 2 proposed interconnection site. This ROW runs south approximately 114 km, following existing logging roads and disturbances to the Project site where possible.

A ranking assessment was completed for the six transmission line options (Table 2-1). A comprehensive list of assessment criteria was developed to rank each alternative. Criteria were also chosen to satisfy each of the following categories:

- Technical;
- Environmental and social;
- Schedule; and
- Costs.

Each category was broken down into several criteria with the ranking assessment matrix (Table 2-1) and assigned a criterion ranking from 1 to 5 defined as follows:

- 1 = Poor;
- 3 = Average; and
- 5 = Good.

Each of the four ranking assessment categories was also assigned a weighting between 0 and 1 based on the relative importance of each category over the others. The category weightings are defined as follows:

- Technical = 0.5 – Relative to the other categories technical viability is much more certain; however, there has been very little on the ground work completed to assess each alignment. A weighting of 0.5 has been chosen to accommodate on the ground uncertainties.
- Environmental and Social = 0.5 – This category has been regarded as very important relative to all other categories; therefore a higher rating has been assigned for this category.

- Schedule = 1.0 – This category has been regarded as very important relative to all other categories.

- Costs = 0.2 – The relative magnitude of costs associated with each option are closely linked to schedule and permitting. Although costs are a very important parameter they bear a lower risk when
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>OPTION 3</th>
<th>OPTION 3A</th>
<th>OPTION 4</th>
<th>OPTION 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voltage</td>
<td>230kV</td>
<td>230kV</td>
<td>230kV</td>
<td>138kV</td>
<td>230kV</td>
<td>230kV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substation</td>
<td>Tachick</td>
<td>2L353 Tap</td>
<td>Glenannen</td>
<td>Glenannen</td>
<td>2L353 Tap</td>
<td>2L353 Tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Length</td>
<td>135km</td>
<td>112km</td>
<td>133km</td>
<td>133km</td>
<td>114km</td>
<td>114km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnection (technical difficulty)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Risk (foundation conditions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain Hazard Risk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Road Crossings (height of line)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability (electrical stability, potential for tree strike, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Category Rating</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Impacts (wetlands, old forest, species at risk and ecological communities at risk)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Impacts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Public Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Category Rating</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA/Permitting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Hydro (permitting and construction)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (function of length)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Category Rating</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTS</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL CAPEX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL OPEX (includes line losses)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Site Substation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Category Rating</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RATING</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL WEIGHTED RATING</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKING</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Rating of issues/risks for each NDC from 1 to 5 where 1 is poor and 5 is good; 2. Weighting of each category is relative to all other categories; 3. Total rating is a summation of the individual rating of all criteria; 4. Total weighted rating is a summation of the category rating multiplied by the category weighting factor. From Knight Piésold Ltd. 2012 (PEA)
Option 1 received one unacceptable rating for socioeconomic considerations relating to land acquisition concerns, and was therefore rejected. Options 2, 4, and 5 received unacceptable ratings for ability to service the site effectively because of anticipated timing constraints related to new interconnecting substation requirements to tie into the BC Hydro grid. During consultations, BC Hydro expressed a strong recommendation for the transmission line terminus to be in Endako at the Glenannen Substation. Use of the Tachick Substation, as was proposed in Option 1, or tap ins to the existing 2L353 transmission line would require substation upgrades which would extend project timelines and require their own environmental assessment processes.

Option 1 crossed 11 km of private lands which affected its ranking in the cost and environmental and social categories. The length and route of this option had the highest amount of overprinting on wetlands, had the greatest effect on old growth forest and crossed a large amount of water courses. This option was therefore rejected.

Option 2 crossed 5 km of private lands resulting in additional cost for land acquisition. Option 2 also scored low in the schedule category because it would require new substation connections to the BC Hydro grid. The approval and construction of such substations is time consuming and is likely to unnecessarly extend the overall Project timelines, resulting in an anticipated overall delay in Project start-up. These factors contributed to the 5th place ranking of Option 2 and its rejection.

The Option 5 route passes through 14 km of difficult terrain affecting its scores in the technical and schedule categories of the assessment. As with Option 2, this alignment would require new substation connections to the BC Hydro grid resulting in lower schedule category ranking scores. The route, along with Option 1, overprints the highest amount of wetland habitats causing a reduced score in the environmental and social category. This option ranked 4th out of the 6 options.

The Option 4 route passes through 28 km of difficult terrain affecting its scores in the technical and schedule categories of the assessment. As with Options 2 and 5, this alignment would require new substation connections to the BC Hydro grid resulting in lower schedule category ranking scores. This option ranked 3rd out of the 6 options.

Option 3A was not retained for further detailed evaluation because 138 kV capacity was determined to be inadequate and unreliable for meeting all Project power needs and was therefore not carried forward into the more detailed alternatives assessment.

Knight Piésold, with input from New Gold and AMEC determined that Option 3 ranked highest in the alternatives assessment. This alignment option involves the construction of a 133-km, 230-kV transmission line to supply the proposed Project with power. The transmission line proposed right of way is 40 m wide and occupies approximately 550 ha. Option 3 crossed no private lands or difficult terrain reducing impacts to the technical, cost and environmental and social categories. The line would have an interconnection to the BC Hydro system at Glenannen Substation near Fraser Lake and not require new substation
connections or development. This Option has the least amount of overprinting of wetlands and intermediate overlap of old growth forest habitats. The combined scores under the technical, schedule, cost, and environmental and social categories led to Option 3 having the highest ranking of the six options and was therefore selected as the preferred route.

3.0 TRANSMISSION LINE ALIGNMENT CONSULTATION

The preferred transmission line alignment was submitted in the Project Description phase of the EA process. There are 30 stakeholders along the preferred transmission line alignment in four categories: guide outfitters, traplines, range tenures and private land parcels (Table 3-1). During the public consultation process New Gold held several public open houses within communities adjacent to the project area to convey project details to stakeholders and regulators and obtain feedback on the selected transmission line alignment. New Gold also proactively approached transmission line stakeholders to present the selected transmission line alignment to find out concerns.

Table 3-1: Transmission Line Stakeholder Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Number of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guide Outfitter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hallett Lake Outfitters, Allen Ray</td>
<td>Cert. No. 701166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crystal Lake Resort, Daniel Brooks</td>
<td>Cert. No. 701156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pitka Mountain Outfitters, Colonel Anderson</td>
<td>Cert. No. 701137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moose Lake Lodge, John Blackwell</td>
<td>Cert. No. 600384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncha Mountain Outfitters, Stefan Muehlmeyer</td>
<td>Cert. No. 601048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Batnuni Lake Guide and Outfitters, Lyle Barsby</td>
<td>Cert. No. 601039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Allen Ray</td>
<td>TR0712T015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Brooks</td>
<td>TR0712T043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve K. Ray</td>
<td>TR0712T029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ernest J. Casimal</td>
<td>TR0712T040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfred George</td>
<td>TR0712T036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TR0712T037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfred Vossen</td>
<td>TR0713T017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malcolm Downie</td>
<td>TR0711T006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary George Joseph</td>
<td>TR0711T007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Even Luggi</td>
<td>TR0712T039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken W. Still</td>
<td>TR0601T006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irvine Herbert and Lloyd L. Sjodin</td>
<td>TR0721T014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosie Cassam</td>
<td>TR0512T027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Brough</td>
<td>TR0601T003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chester Larson</td>
<td>TR0604T053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholders and regulators provided inputs on various aspects of the transmission line alignment and were taken into consideration for possible re-routes where necessary or applicable (Table 3-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Number of Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range Tenure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Susan Steiner</td>
<td>RAN077238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chester Larson</td>
<td>RAN077234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNT Ranching, Craig Nugent</td>
<td>RAN077117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dykam Ranch and Woodlot, Doug Short</td>
<td>RAN077118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rim Rock Ranch, Jim Brophy</td>
<td>RAN075967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Lepoidevin</td>
<td>RAN075941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Mills</td>
<td>RAN075154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Geary</td>
<td>RAN077486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Land Parcel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nature Trust</td>
<td>PID015135233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-2: Transmission Line Alignment Concerns Raised by Stakeholders During the Consultation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Concern(s) Raised</th>
<th>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guide Outfitter</td>
<td>Allen Ray, Cert. No. 701166, Trapline TR0712T015; Hallett Lake Outfitters</td>
<td>Transmission Line Update Meeting (04/15/2013); Transmission Line Meeting (10/25/2012)</td>
<td>Move TL to avoid guiding and trapping trails and cabins used by these groups; Fought to keep road out of his guiding area, wants it left as prime hunting area; Requested that we consider following the 1100 road and cross his territory near the 1100 road bridge at the eastern end of Tahultzu Lake. He also asked us to stay within ¼ mile of Tahultzu Lake on the east side. He has a cabin about a ¼ mile east of the 1100 road at this location, and that as you move away from the lake the area gets quite swampy. The ideal spot to cross in consideration of his concerns and in terms of span length is likely alongside the 1100 road; Offered to show New Gold the location of his suggested re-routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Outfitter/Trapline Holder</td>
<td>Daniel Brooks, Cert. No. 701156, Trapline TR0712T043; Crystal Lake Resort</td>
<td>Meeting with Ryan Todd (10/16/2012); e-mail correspondence (10/16/2012 and 10/30/2012); Transmission Line Update Meeting (04/15/2013); Project introduction at the UNWC AGM (01/22/13)</td>
<td>Proximity of TL to his property and opening up new access to hunting areas in his guide-outfitting territory; Connecting the Kenny Dam Rd to East Swanson FSR allowing access to ATVs and hunters to his guide-outfitting territory; Avoid paralleling his road; Move TL west where is crosses Greer Creek; Avoid mountainous area near his home close to Mount Greer; Crossing the Kluskus FSR south of the Nechako is a no-go, it’s fine to cross north of the Brophy property</td>
<td>Discuss 2 solutions: Move the TL further west away from the property or move route so that more of the TL is on the property giving Mr. Brooks control over access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Outfitter</td>
<td>Colonel Anderson, Cert. No. 701137, Pitka Mountain Outfitters Ltd.</td>
<td>Letter to CEAA (01/19/2013); Transmission Line Update Meeting (04/15/2013); Meeting with Ryan Todd 11/14/2012</td>
<td>Portion of his territory south of the highway represents less than 20% of the area he uses; Opening up access to his territory to hunters; Would prefer the TL to follow existing roads and power lines to prevent creating new access; Happy with the proposed re-route north of Nithi Mountain, happy it’s following existing roads; New Gold should consider Lepoidevin’s range tenure in the re-route area; Avoid construction in the fall to minimize human activity/noise impacts to hunting and trapping activities</td>
<td>Re-route to go north of Nithi Mountain; Checked into Lepoidevin’s range tenure with BC MFLNRO and the range is no longer active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Type</td>
<td>Stakeholder ID</td>
<td>Level of Engagement</td>
<td>Concern(s) Raised</td>
<td>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Outfitter</td>
<td>John Blackwell, Cert. No. 600384, Moose Lake Lodge</td>
<td>Land Use Meeting (10/23/2012); E-mail correspondence (03/11/2013)</td>
<td>No concerns regarding project activities at this time, the mine area in his territory is heavily affected by mountain pine beetle and logging so there is nothing to protect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Outfitter</td>
<td>Stefan Muehlmeyer, Cert. No. 601048, Uncha Mountain Outfitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Outfitter</td>
<td>Lyle Barsby, Cert No. 601039, Batnuni Lake Guide and Outfitters</td>
<td>Project update phone calls (10/25/2012 and 11/19/2012); Meeting (11/26/2012)</td>
<td>Access from residential hunters and recreationalists coming into territory and scaring game; Tenure will become useless and would like New Gold to purchase this parcel</td>
<td>New Gold is not currently entering into compensation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Steve K. Ray, TR0712T029</td>
<td>Transmission Line Update Meeting (04/15/2013)</td>
<td>Avoiding guiding and trapping trails and cabin where valuable goods are stored; Recommend re-routes</td>
<td>New Gold took suggestions to engineers to explore possible re-routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Ernest J. Casimal, TR0712T040</td>
<td>Telephone meeting (11/20/2012)</td>
<td>No major concerns as trapline as not been used in several years; Would like to be compensated; Would like the TL to parallel existing BC Hydro power lines</td>
<td>Proposed paralleling the existing BC Hydro power line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Alfred George (Louie George and Sally Adolph), TR0712T036</td>
<td>Telephone conversations (11/29/2012 and 04/30/2013)</td>
<td>Not currently using the trapline but would like to know how their territory will be affected by the project; Forestry has removed most of the trees from their territory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>TR0712T037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Alfred Vossen, TR0713T017</td>
<td>Telephone conversations and meeting requests (10/30/2012 and 04/03/2013)</td>
<td>As long as New Gold's activities are south of the Endako River, he has no concerns. No concerns over the re-routes.</td>
<td>Contacted him to set up meeting to discuss the TL alignment and to provide updated re-route information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Malcolm Downie, TR0711T006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Type</td>
<td>Stakeholder ID</td>
<td>Level of Engagement</td>
<td>Concern(s) Raised</td>
<td>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Gary George Joseph, TR0711T007</td>
<td>Telephone conversations, meetings, drop in meetings (10/30/2012, 11/14/2012, 01/16, 2013, 01/22/2013, 03/18/2013 and 05/23/2013)</td>
<td>Family hasn’t trapped in a few years due to fur prices and exploration activities scaring away the animals; Do not want TL on the trapline for any reason; Would like a lease agreement for land use with New Gold; Concerns TL will provide additional access to ATVs and ski-dos; TL could have negative impacts on the hunting the family does in this area; Not satisfied that he has been consulted properly, feels his family members have been consulted, not him, wants to speak to someone with authority</td>
<td>New Gold conducted the intro meeting to introduce stakeholders to the project and transmission line and to get their feedback on the TL route; Route can be altered if stakeholders have concerns; No agreements will be entered with stakeholders at this point; Has Ryan Todd’s contact information and he can contact him at any time and provide feedback; Provide him with map and have him accompany consultants on fieldwork in the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Even Luggi, TR0712T039</td>
<td>Meetings (11/14/2012 and 04/16/2013)</td>
<td>Robert Luggi Jr. Does not actively trap, hasn’t for years, there is no money in it; No improvements have been made to this trapline (no cabins built or trails); Would like New Gold to follow existing roads and BC Hydro ROWs and provided a few alternative routes; Evan Luggi has been trapping this year and furs have been good; No concerns over the TL re-routes; Wanted to discuss compensation</td>
<td>Discussed suggested re-routes and provided them to engineering team, provided updated re-routes for discussion, precedent for compensation for trapline holders but not entering into these discussions at this point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Ken W. Still, TR0601T006</td>
<td>Project introduction meeting, Transmission line update meeting (11/20/2012 and 04/17/2013)</td>
<td>Impacts of development to furbearers and wondered if studies would be conducted to determine these effects; Where the TL crosses his trapline is good marten and lynx trapping country; He often traps along existing roads; Financial impacts due to trapline; Re-route better for him but crossing his trapline anywhere will have some negative impact; Fur prices are good now due to the demand from China; Happy the TL follows roads through most of his trapline; Compensation</td>
<td>New Gold will follow up with AMEC about the furbearers; New Gold will wait for project approval before moving ahead with compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Type</td>
<td>Stakeholder ID</td>
<td>Level of Engagement</td>
<td>Concern(s) Raised</td>
<td>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Irvine Herbert and Lloyd L. Sjodin, TR0712T014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some areas TL passes through are swampy and will be hard to maintain; Water quality in Chedakuz Creek and increased access to the area are her main concerns; The TL is a long way from her cabin so she has no problem with its location; Does a small amount of trapping to maintain her license but fur prices are so low, this is not a reliable source of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Rosie Cassam, TR0512T027</td>
<td>Project introduction meeting, Transmission line update meeting (11/30/2012 and 04/17/2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline</td>
<td>Sandra Brough, TR0601T003</td>
<td>Project introduction meeting, Transmission line update meeting (11/30/2012 and 04/17/2013)</td>
<td>Some areas TL passes through are swampy and will be hard to maintain; Water quality in Chedakuz Creek and increased access to the area are her main concerns; The TL is a long way from her cabin so she has no problem with its location; Does a small amount of trapping to maintain her license but fur prices are so low, this is not a reliable source of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapline/Range Tenue</td>
<td>Chester Larson, TR0604T053, RAN077234</td>
<td>Project update meeting (10/31/2012)</td>
<td>Not concerned about impacts to his trapline but worried about effects to cattle and to his grazing areas; Fencing may be required in strategic areas to prevent cattle from wandering down hydro line</td>
<td>New Gold has re-routed the TL outside of this trapline and range tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Tenure</td>
<td>CNT Ranching Ltd., Craig Nugent, RAN077117</td>
<td>Project introduction meeting, Transmission Line update meeting (01/23/2013 and 04/16/2013)</td>
<td>Not strongly opposed to original TL alignment but would prefer so see it outside his range boundary and fenced; Increased access to ATVs, hunters, parties, campfires/fires on his property due to land clearing; Pleased to find out TL followed existing 1100 Rd; Could the line be changed to follow the south and west boundary of his range; Compensation for the cost of the fencing; Deeded properties to the south of his range</td>
<td>New Gold has re-routed the TL to outside the western edge of his range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Project/Meeting Details</th>
<th>Concern(s) Raised</th>
<th>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range Tenure</td>
<td>Susan Steiner, RAN077238</td>
<td>Project update meeting, telephone conversation, transmission line update meeting (01/30/2013, 02/06/2013 and 04/16/2013)</td>
<td>South and east of Nolan Lake near border between Steiner and Larson ranges are rare grasslands BC MFLNRO concerned with protecting; Area to the south where the TL exits the range is very steep and opening up the area may create problems; Weed control and species used to revegetate; Clearing areas and how to contain their cattle; Have built fence with MFLNRO on north west of range worried TL will destroy this fence; Increased access, cattle guards may be required; Re-route proposed: move route to head east above Nithi Mountain then south following logging roads south to Foster Lake and tie in with the proposed line slightly north of Dorman Lake; Happy with this since logging and roads have opening up this area already; Very pleased with updated alignment but may still need to ensure no fence destruction and cattle guards</td>
<td>New Gold will provide an invasive weed management plan; Plants for revegetation will reduce access and be species which will not attract cattle and grazers; Changed alignment to head north of Nithi Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Tenure</td>
<td>Dykam Ranch and Woodlot Ltd, Doug Short, RAN077118</td>
<td>Transmission Line update meeting (04/16/2013)</td>
<td>Area north of his private property is very swampy and might not be feasible for TL construction; Molybdenum entering waterways and poisoning cattle; Keeping cattle off the Kluskus FSR since his range is not fenced, fencing options discussed</td>
<td>Discussed fencing options; Molybdenum releases will be minimal and not of concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Tenure</td>
<td>Rim Rock Ranch Ltd., Jim Brophy, RAN075967</td>
<td>Project introduction and Transmission Line update meeting (01/24/2013 and 04/15/2013)</td>
<td>Fencing and cattle guards may be required; Willing to offer suggestions for re-routes that will minimize the amount of fencing required and maximize the use of natural barriers; Cattle avoid transmission line areas; Line should not go over Mount Greer; Suggest using area near 31 Rd on the Kluskus which has already been opened up by mountain pine beetle; Containing cattle and noxious weed growth; Land values and saleability of property</td>
<td>Transmission line on son’s property is much larger than the one proposed for this project; TL alignment will move south of Mount Greer and minimize area it extends through this range; Weed management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Tenure</td>
<td>Peter Lepoidevin, RAN075941, RAN073967</td>
<td>Transmission Line update meeting (04/23/2013)</td>
<td>Discussed in meeting with BC MFLNRO; Guide outfitter had brought up this tenure; Ranch tenure no longer active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stakeholder Type

#### Range Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Concern(s) Raised</th>
<th>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry Mills, RAN075154</td>
<td>Project update meeting (04/16/2013)</td>
<td>TL along the FSR will impact their airstrip; New Gold could “lease” the airstrip from them; Compensation; Cost of moving airstrip; Not worried about property devaluation</td>
<td>New Gold is looking at a variety of other sites; New Gold will look into the cost of moving the airstrip; Propose a route that passes north of the Mills tenure and above Doug Short’s private property; Still in negotiations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Range Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Concern(s) Raised</th>
<th>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louis Geary, RAN077486</td>
<td></td>
<td>TL will pass through Geary range tenure if alignment moved north around Mills tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Private Land Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Concern(s) Raised</th>
<th>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature Trust, Carl MacNaughton, PID 015135233, DL2556 R5C</td>
<td>Telephone conversation (03/20/13)</td>
<td>Is reviewing New Gold’s proposed route through their property and hopes to have a response soon</td>
<td>New Gold would like to re-route the TL alignment through their parcel to cross the Stellako River at a new location proposed by BC MFLNRO to minimize disturbance to the Wildlife Management Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table continued...*
## Stakeholder Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Type</th>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Concern(s) Raised</th>
<th>Concern(s) Addressed by New Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Government</td>
<td>BC Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</td>
<td>Meetings, e-mails ((04/17/2013, 12/13/2012))</td>
<td>May have concerns over the TL passing through the Chedakuz Creek area; TL crossing the Stellako River through a Wildlife Management Area, the Wildlife Act states that land in a WMA can’t be used without written permission from the regional manager (the area is important sockeye spawning habitat and rainbow trout overwintering area); Preferred if TL ties into existing hydro ROW or parallel to an existing ROW so there is no new disturbance along the Stellako River; Grasslands on the south-facing slope of Nithi Mountain is a special and unique habitat and want to minimize impacts there (rare grassland may be present), it would be better to stay low along main roads; Similar values on south facing slope south-west of Mount Greer; The TL crossing of the Nechako Canyon is over steep terrain so may impact migrating raptors; Be sure to inform range tenure holders and give them a chance to comment on the alignment; Pleased with re-route on Steiner range tenure to north side of Nithi Mountain; Barry Mills is considering land near Suscha Lake area for grazing as compensation for range tenure reduction near the New Gold site; Alternate route north of Doug Short’s property is very close to Sandra Brough’s cabin and could negatively impact her range land, the BC MFLNRO supports the route along the Kluskus FSR; working on the approval process for WMA, New Gold should speak to Nature Trust about getting approvals to pass through their parcel; Change route to head north around Nithi Mountain then follow the logging roads south and tie in to proposed route north of Dorman Lake; Use fencing, cattle guards, and natural boundaries to control access and would prefer no new access routes through range tenures</td>
<td>Working with Nature Trust on possible re-route through their parcel; Re-route alignment north of Nithi Mountain away from sensitive habitat and range tenures; Re-route alignment away from south facing slope of Mount Greer and steep portions of the Nechako Canyon; Have communicated with range tenure holders through meetings, e-mails and telephone conversations and are taking concerns and re-route suggestions into consideration; New Gold still in negotiations with Mills family regarding the landing strip and alignment through the area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note:
- ATV – all-terrain vehicle; BC MFLNRO – BC Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations; FSR – forest service road; Rd – road; ROW – right-of-way; TL – transmission line; WMA – Wildlife Management Area
The consultation process raised several key concerns regarding the baseline transmission line alignment:

- Guiding and trapline tenure disturbance;
- Cattle ranch and cattle grazing disturbance; and
- Staying close to existing roads and BC Hydro ROWs;
- Access for current tenure holders being maintained while keeping destructive or disturbance creating recreational users limited; and
- Maintaining sensitive habitats.

The concerns raised during the consultation process resulted in 11 possible re-routes for segments of the preferred transmission line (Table 3-3). Some of the proposed re-routes were incorporated into the transmission line alignment while others were not. Negotiations are still taking place for two of the proposed re-routes: the Stellako River Crossing and the Mills Ranch re-route. Figure 3-1 shows the original Option 3 transmission line alignment as well as the incorporation of the accepted re-routes and the re-routes which are currently being negotiated.
### Table 3-3: Transmission Line Alignment Proposed Re-Routes with Justifications for Final Alignment Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-Route Number</th>
<th>Re-Route Description</th>
<th>Advantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Disadvantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Recommendation for Final Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follow BC Hydro ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Several private parcels would need to be crossed to follow the proposed route</td>
<td>Follow the preferred alignment in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 3 km longer than the preferred route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The longer length may result in greater technical and environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The capital cost would increase by approximately $960,000 due to the longer length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cross Stellako River at BC Hydro ROW</td>
<td>Would help reduce visual and aquatic life impacts</td>
<td>Private parcel held by the Nature Trust will need to be crossed in order to realise the benefits noted</td>
<td>Follow the preferred alignment due to the potential issues associated with crossing the Nature Trust parcel. New Gold has been in contact with the Nature Trust in order to determine a solution for crossing their parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 1.1 km longer than the preferred route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The capital cost would increase by approximately $350,000 due to the longer length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shift alignment north of Nithi Mountain</td>
<td>Several existing roads and favourable ground conditions along the re-route will help to make construction easier</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 2.2 km longer</td>
<td>Follow the re-route to the north of Nithi Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The capital cost would decrease by approximately $260,000 due to better construction conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-Route Number</th>
<th>Re-Route Description</th>
<th>Advantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Disadvantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Recommendation for Final Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shift alignment west to avoid ranch tenure area</td>
<td>Access to the re-route alignment would be reduced by moving the alignment away from existing access</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 1.1 km longer, Impacts to sensitive habitats and wetland complexes would be introduced, The capital cost would increase by approximately $120,000 due to longer length</td>
<td>Follow the alignment presented in re-route number 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shift alignment west to avoid grassland/bushland</td>
<td>This alignment will help mitigate impacts to the rancher and to the sensitive habitats</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 0.6 km longer, The capital cost would increase by approximately $255,000 due to longer length</td>
<td>Follow the alignment presented in re-route number 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Move alignment to north end of Tahultzu Lake to avoid guide outfitter tenure</td>
<td>This alignment would help mitigate impacts to the guide outfitter and to the mature forested area</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 0.3 km longer, The capital cost would increase by approximately $96,000 due to longer length</td>
<td>Follow this re-route option even though there is an increase in cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Move alignment west to avoid mature forest and sensitive south facing slopes</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 0.3 km shorter, This alignment would help mitigate impacts to the mature forested area and sensitive south facing slopes, The capital cost would decrease by approximately $1,013,000 due to the shorter length and better construction conditions</td>
<td>At least one private parcel would need to be crossed</td>
<td>If an easement over the private land parcel can be successfully negotiated, this re-route option should be followed due to the significant cost savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Move alignment west to avoid mature forest and sensitive south facing slopes</td>
<td>This alignment would help mitigate impacts to the mature forested area, sensitive south facing slopes, and impacts to private property</td>
<td>The re-route 8A would be approximately 1.9 km longer, The capital cost would decrease by approximately $596,000 due to the better construction conditions</td>
<td>Follow re-route option 8A due to the significant cost savings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-Route Number</th>
<th>Re-Route Description</th>
<th>Advantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Disadvantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Recommendation for Final Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Follow Kluskus FSR and avoid wetland complexes to north of Tatelkuz Lake</td>
<td>This alignment would help mitigate impacts to wetland complexes and be easier to construct</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 1.5 km longer</td>
<td>If an agreement with the Mill’s Ranch can be negotiated, follow this route due to the significant cost savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The capital cost would decrease by approximately $577,000 due to the better construction conditions</td>
<td>Special design considerations will be required to help mitigate airstrip sterilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This alignment will need to be routed through a narrow strip of crown land between two private parcels that is 30 m wide and 60 m long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Follow Kluskus FSR from Mt. Greer south</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 20.8 km longer</td>
<td>Follow the preferred alignment due to the significant cost savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be significant logistical constraints by following the Kluskus FSR due to regular heavy logging traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional environmental impacts will be realized due to increased line length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The capital cost would increase by approximately $5,466,000 due to longer length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table continued...*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-Route Number</th>
<th>Re-Route Description</th>
<th>Advantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Disadvantages of Re-Route</th>
<th>Recommendation for Final Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Follow Holy Cross FSR from Nithi River south</td>
<td>The re-route would be approximately 3.6 km longer</td>
<td>There would be significant logistical constraints by following the Holy Cross FSR due to regular heavy logging traffic</td>
<td>Follow the preferred alignment due to the significant cost savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional environmental impacts will be realized due to increased line length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts to recreational values surrounding the Nechako Reservoir and private land would need to be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The capital cost would increase by approximately $1,152,000 due to longer length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 TRANSMISSION LINE ALIGNMENT OPTION 3B

Stakeholder consultation has resulted in a preferred transmission line alignment which will be referred to as Option 3B. This alignment was evaluated in the same manner as the original 6 proposed options as seen in Table 2-1. When evaluated in terms of technical, environmental and social, schedule and cost categories, Option 3B ranks the highest of the seven alignments (Table 4-1). This ranking takes into account the re-routes to avoid sensitive habitats, stakeholder land parcels and re-routes through areas which have been disturbed previously and which will facilitate construction. Over 70% of this alignment is along pre-existing roads and disturbances.
### Table 4-1: Transmission Line – Alternatives Assessment Ranking Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Weight (0-1)</th>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>OPTION 3</th>
<th>OPTION 3A</th>
<th>OPTION 3B</th>
<th>OPTION 4</th>
<th>OPTION 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tachick</td>
<td>2L353 Tap</td>
<td>Glenannen</td>
<td>Glenannen</td>
<td>Glenannen</td>
<td>2L353 Tap</td>
<td>2L353 Tap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Length</td>
<td>135km</td>
<td>112km</td>
<td>133km</td>
<td>133km</td>
<td>140km</td>
<td>114km</td>
<td>114km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnection (technical difficulty)</td>
<td>5 2 5 3 5 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Risk (foundation conditions)</td>
<td>1 3 3 3 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain Hazard Risk</td>
<td>4 5 3 3 3 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Road Crossings (height of line)</td>
<td>2 3 3 3 2 3 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability (electrical stability, potential for tree strike, etc.)</td>
<td>2 4 4 2 4 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Category Rating</strong></td>
<td>7 8.5 9 7 8.5 7.5 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations</td>
<td>2 3 3 3 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Impacts (wetlands, old forest, species at risk and ecological communities at risk)</td>
<td>1 4 3 3 4 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Impacts</td>
<td>2 4 3 3 4 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Impacts</td>
<td>3 4 2 2 2 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Public Services</td>
<td>4 5 5 5 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>1 3 5 5 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Category Rating</strong></td>
<td>6.5 11.5 10.5 10.5 11.5 10.5 10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHEDULE</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA/Permitting</td>
<td>1 1 5 5 5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Hydro (permitting and construction)</td>
<td>5 1 5 5 5 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2 4 2 2 3 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Category Rating</strong></td>
<td>8 6 12 12 13 10 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTS</strong></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnection</td>
<td>4 2 4 2 4 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL CAPEX</td>
<td>2 4 2 2 5 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL OPEX (includes line losses)</td>
<td>3 5 2 1 2 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Site Substation</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 4 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Category Rating</strong></td>
<td>2.2 2.6 2 2.4 2.2 2.4 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RATING</strong></td>
<td>45 56 55 54 59 53 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL WEIGHTED RATING</strong></td>
<td>23.7 28.6 33 31.9 35.2 30.4 29.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANKING</strong></td>
<td>7 6 2 3 1 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Rating of issues/risks for each MDC from 1 to 5 where 1 is poor and 5 is good;
2. Weighting of each category is relative to all other categories;
3. Total rating is a summation of the individual rating of all criteria;
4. Total weighted rating is a summation of the category rating multiplied by the category weighting factor.