

Appendix 2-E

*Summary of Issues, Concerns, and Interests Raised by Aboriginal
Groups during the Pre-Application Stage*

MURRAY RIVER COAL PROJECT

Application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate / Environmental Impact Statement

Appendix 2-E. Summary of Issues, Concerns and Interests Raised by Aboriginal Groups during the Pre-Application Stage

Topic	Summary of Issue, Concern or Interest	Raised by	Source	Proponent Response
Engagement Process	Capacity funding to participate in baseline studies, negotiations, and third party review	MLIB WMFN SFN	MLIB correspondence March 24, 2010 MLIB meeting June 19, 2012 MLIB correspondence February 4, 2013 MLIB meeting May 16, 2013 SFN correspondence February 11, 2010 SFN correspondence July 6, 2011 SFN meeting July 13, 2012 SFN correspondence October 13, 2012 SFN correspondence December 18, 2012 SFN correspondence January 23, 2013 SFN meeting March 26, 2013 MLIB, WMFN, SFN meeting September 6, 2012 WMFN correspondence December 14, 2012 WMFN correspondence February 15, 2013 PGL correspondence February 6, 2013	The CEA Agency made funding available to support participation in the federal environmental assessment of the Project on July 31, 2013. MLIB, SFN, BRFN, SCFN, KLMSS, and MNBC received funding. In addition, the Proponent provided funding to MLIB, SFN and WMFN to support their participation in the environmental assessment of the Project.
	First Nations' participation in the development of valued components	SFN	SFN meeting October 11, 2012 SFN correspondence December 18, 2012	Draft Application Information Requirements (dAIR) were submitted to Working Group members on September 26, 2012 and posted on the BC EAO Project Information Centre (e-PIC) website on May 15, 2012. Comments on the dAIR were submitted to the BC EAO by the West Moberly First Nations on September 29, 2012 and by Sauleau First Nations on December 20, 2012. The First Nations' third party Application/EIS reviewer (PGL) submitted comments to the BC EAO on July 19, 2013. The Proponent provided responses to Working Group and public comments on December 14, 2012, January 4, 2013, May 7, 2013, July 29, 2013, and August 22, 2013. The BC EAO posted the approved AIR on the e-PIC website on September 3, 2013.
	First Nations' participation in Application/EIS studies	WMFN SFN MLIB	SFN meeting July 13, 2012 SFN correspondence December 18, 2012 Duz Cho Construction correspondence March 8, 2013 PGL correspondence February 13, 2013 MLIB meeting August 2, 2012	SFN and WMFN community members participated in Application/EIS studies as field assistants. The Proponent provided funding for an Environmental Monitor Course for MLIB, SFN, WMFN and Halfway River First Nation. In addition, MLIB, SFN and WMNF have the opportunity to review and comment on the Application/EIS through a third-party review process funded by the Proponent. The proponent provided funding to SFN to work with the Firelight Group to create an SFN Knowledge and Use Study for the Project. The proponent funded WMFN to work with Askiy Resources Consulting to create a WMFN Socio-economic Baseline Study.
	Need to develop engagement agreements (e.g. MOU, confidentiality agreement, participation agreement)	SFN MLIB WMFN	SFN meeting November 22, 2012 SFN meeting March 26, 2013 SFN correspondence April 15, 2013 WMFN meeting August 5, 2010 WMFN meeting May 17, 2013 MLIB correspondence March 24, 2010 MLIB meeting July 12, 2012	The Proponent established a number of agreements with Aboriginal groups, including an MOU with MLIB in 2010, a confidentiality agreement with SFN in 2012, and an agreement regarding third party review of the Application/EIS with MLIB, SFN and WMFN. The Proponent is currently in discussions with MLIB on an MOU and with WMFN on a Protocol Agreement.
	Potential impact of EA timelines on treaty rights	SFN	SFN correspondence December 18, 2012	The Proponent will adhere to timelines as specified in the BC <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> and the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> , as well as any timelines specified by the BC EAO and/or the CEA Agency.
	Process to deal with environmental concerns prior to Application/EIS	SFN	SFN meeting November 22, 2012	The Proponent has engaged with SFN and other First Nations since 2010 to describe the Project and to understand First Nations' issues, concerns and interests. The Proponent funded a third party review of the Application/EIS for MLIB, SFN and WMFN and has considered comments from an initial community scoping meeting. As members of the Working group, SFN, MLIB and WMFN have raised issues, concerns and interests and provided comments on the dAIR.
	Confidentiality for human environment research participants	MLIB	MLIB correspondence May 21, 2013	The Proponent adheres to appropriate research methods involving human subjects and forwarded a draft research confidentiality agreement to MLIB for comment and review.
	First Nations input on local and regional study areas, and wildlife species included in the Application/EIS	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	As members of the Working Group, MLIB, SFN and WMFN have had the opportunity to review and comment on the dAIR, including study areas and wildlife species considered in the Application/EIS. The Proponent provided responses to Working Group comments on the dAIR in May 2013.

Appendix 2-E. Summary of Issues, Concerns and Interests Raised by Aboriginal Groups during the Pre-Application Stage

Topic	Summary of Issue, Concern or Interest	Raised by	Source	Proponent Response
Engagement Process (cont'd)	Need for First Nations to be included throughout environmental assessment process	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	MLIB, SFN and WMFN participate as members of the Working Group. In addition, the Proponent funded a third party review of the Application EIS for MLIB, SFN and WMFN.
	Lack of consultation with First Nations	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Consultation activities with Aboriginal groups are described in Chapter 2 (Information Distribution and Consultation) of the Application/EIS.
	Request to visit Project site	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN meeting July 13, 2012 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Aboriginal groups were invited to tour the proposed project site. The McLeod Lake Indian Band Coal Coordinator toured the reclaimed project drill sites with the Proponent on July 13, 2010. A West Moberly First Nations Councillor and Land Manager toured the mine site with the Proponent on November 23, 2011. First Nations representatives toured the site as part of the Working Group on October 3, 2012. In addition, the Proponent invited Aboriginal groups to tour the Monkman Common staff housing development in Tumbler Ridge on November 24, 2012.
	First Nations to complete their own traditional land use studies and heritage studies	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	MLIB meeting July 12, 2012 SFN meeting July 13, 2012 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Proponent agreed to fund a Saulteau First Nations <i>Knowledge and Use Study Specific to HD Mining International Ltd.'s Proposed Murray River Coal Mine Project</i> (undertaken by the Firelight Group) on September 11, 2013. West Moberly First Nations informed the Proponent on March 18, 2013 that it would prefer to identify its own consultant to undertake a traditional knowledge and use study. To date, the West Moberly First Nations have not selected a consultant to undertake a TK/TU study. The Proponent developed a TK/TU proposal and work plan for McLeod Lake Indian Band. McLeod Lake Indian Band Chief and Council approved the proposal and work plan; however, no work has been completed to date as the research is contingent on a yet-to-be finalized memorandum of understanding between the McLeod Lake Indian Band and the Proponent.
Environment	Potential effects on caribou and other wildlife, including: habitat effects; migration patterns; sensitive lifecycle periods; health; sacred wildlife. Potential effects on wildlife from Project conveyer belt.	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN meeting July 13, 2012 SFN comments on dAIR December 20, 2012 MLIB meeting June 19, 2012 WMFN meeting May 17, 2013 WMFN correspondence October 1, 2012 WMFN Open House June 6, 2013 MLIB meeting June 19, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Project design will minimize wildlife habitat effects by creating a small footprint, utilizing already disturbed land, and using existing access roads. Over the course of Project design, the Proponent chose to make a substantial change from an approximately four kilometre overland conveyor that would cross Murray River to a second underground decline under Murray River. This change will reduce potential effects to wildlife mobility associated with linear developments, fish habitat, and archaeological sites. In response to First Nations' comments on the dAIR, the Proponent made a number of changes, including: modification of fish and fish habitat VCs to be more inclusive of all potential fish species, including Artic Grayling; adding dust deposition to a list of contaminants; expanding the spatial extents of the groundwater model; inserting of a description of wetland functions to be assessed; and including of bullet point indicating the exposure to contaminants will be assessed as a potential effect to wildlife VCs. The Project will minimize direct interaction with wildlife by: adhering to wildlife sensitive periods, guidelines and recommended minimum target buffer distances for important species and sensitive wildlife habitats; controlling traffic to avoid collisions with wildlife; minimize attractants; and enforcing a no hunting policy for employees and contractors. Potential effects of the Project on wildlife and mitigation measures are further described in the Chapter 13 (Assessment of Wildlife Effects).
	Potential effects on water use and water quality (Murray River, Pine River, Wolverine River, Peace River, M20 Creek, dust control, settlement ponds, overall water use, aquatic resources)	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	WMFN meeting May 17, 2013 WMFN Open House June 6, 2013 MLIB meeting June 19, 2012 MLIB Information Session October 1, 2012 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Water management is a key factor in the Project's engineering design. Substantial effort has been invested to develop Project infrastructure that minimizes reliance upon, or potential effects to, local water sources. This includes recycling water in the coal preparation plant, constructing clean water diversions, and mitigating seepage losses to groundwater. Mitigation of the effects of mine construction, operation and closure will include (where appropriate): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • diversion of water around construction areas; • application of erosion and sediment control measures to minimize the concentration and channelization of water over disturbed areas; • ditching and sedimentation ponds around stockpile areas to attenuate peak flows before water is re-introduced to local waterways; and • regular inspection of water management infrastructure to ensure continued function. Potential effects of the Project on water quality and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 8 (Assessment of Surface Water and Aquatic Environment Effects).

Appendix 2-E. Summary of Issues, Concerns and Interests Raised by Aboriginal Groups during the Pre-Application Stage

Topic	Summary of Issue, Concern or Interest	Raised by	Source	Proponent Response
Environment (cont'd)	Potential effects on groundwater (water table and underground springs)	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	WMFN Open House June 6, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	It is recognized that at this stage in Project planning, there is a high degree of uncertainty associated with estimating groundwater inflows to the underground mine. Two independent means of estimating inflow rates have been developed to support mine planning, and sensitivity analysis has been completed both of potential inflow rates, and of estimated water quality. Potential effects of the Project on groundwater and water quality and associated mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 7 (Assessment of Groundwater Effects) and Chapter 8 (Assessment of Surface Water and Aquatic Environment Effects) and associated appendices.
	Potential effects on fish and fish habitat, including impacts on spawning and fish protection, due to changes in water quantity and quality	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	WMFN Open House June 6, 2013 Sub-Working Group (fish) teleconference November 22, 2013	Measures to protect fisheries resources (in addition to water quality control) will include: adhering to appropriate fisheries operating windows for fish-bearing streams; minimizing the potential for spills into fish-bearing streams; protecting fish habitat near project infrastructure; and adhering to all regulations and best-practices. Potential effects of the Project on fish and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 9 (Assessment of Fish and Fish Habitat Effects).
	Potential effects on trees and vegetation (e.g., timber harvesting, disturbance of native plants)	SFN	SFN comments on dAIR December 20, 2012	The Project design will minimize effects on trees and vegetation by creating a small footprint, utilizing already disturbed land, and using existing access roads. Mitigation measures will include use of best management practices for construction activities, including vegetation clearing, erosion and sediment control, and invasive plant management. Potential effects of the Project on trees and vegetation and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 11 (Assessment of Terrestrial Ecology Effects).
	Potential effects relating to explosives	MLIB	MLIB meeting June 19, 2013	Use of explosives is anticipated to very limited for the Project - only for short segments through more competent rock during construction of the Production Decline.
	Potential effects of noise on wildlife (e.g. movement patterns and breeding behaviour)	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	A noise modelling study has been completed to support the effects assessment. The model results are directly incorporated into the assessment of potential effects to wildlife VCs. This includes point source noises from the coal processing plant, ventilation fans, etc., as well as mobile noise sources (e.g., truck and train). Potential effects of the Project on wildlife and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 13 (Assessment of Wildlife Effects).
	Potential changes to the climate	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Climate effects will be minimized by properly maintaining equipment, minimizing equipment idling, driving vehicles at designated speeds and reducing methane liberation. Potential effects of the Project on climate and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 6 (Assessment of Air Quality Effects).
	Potential effects on the ozone layer	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Potential effects on the ozone layer are not included in the scope of this assessment. A brief discussion of ozone is included in the Air Quality Modelling report that is appended to Chapter 6 (Assessment of Air Quality Effects).
	Consequences to terrain stability in the event of an earthquake	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Project is located in the low seismic hazard area (Natural Resources Canada 2013). Project infrastructure is designed to meet appropriate seismic criteria, and with required factors of safety. Earthquakes are addressed in Chapter 23 (Effects of the Environment on the Project).
	Potential effects on air quality due to the generation of coal dust	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN meeting July 13, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The potential effects of dust are included in Chapter 6 (Assessment of Air Quality Effects) and associated appendices. Dust mitigation measures are included in the Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan (Chapter 24.2).
	Potential effects of invasive plants associated with reclamation activities	PGL	PGL Letter to CEA Agency, March 4, 2014	The Proponent will protect vegetation through measures to minimize the potential for invasive plants, including (among other measures): identifying ecosystems with low resiliency to invasive plants; minimizing vegetation clearing dimensions; minimizing soil degradation; conducting vehicle inspections; and detecting and eradicating invasive plants. Potential effects of the Project on ecosystems and mitigation measures will be further described in Chapter 11 (Assessment of Terrestrial Ecology Effects).

Appendix 2-E. Summary of Issues, Concerns and Interests Raised by Aboriginal Groups during the Pre-Application Stage

Topic	Summary of Issue, Concern or Interest	Raised by	Source	Proponent Response
Environment (cont'd)	Potential effects on plant health due to contaminants	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Potential pathways of vegetation contamination include dust deposition, leaching and transport with runoff or seepage, and accidental spills. The potential effects of dust on Terrestrial Ecosystems and mitigation measures are addressed in Chapter 11 (Assessment of Effects on Terrestrial Ecology). Dust mitigation measures will be addressed in the Air Quality and Dust Control Management Plan located in Chapter 24 (Environmental Management and Monitoring Plans). As outlined in the Project Description (Chapter 3), the CCR pile design includes an extensive seepage collection system to help prevent leaching and transport of potential contaminants. Potential contamination associated with spills of hazardous substances and their release into the surrounding environment will be avoided through appropriate storage, handling, and transportation measures, inspection schedule, and spill emergency response plan described in section 24.19 (Spill Response).
	Potential for accumulation of contaminants in soil	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Soils were analyzed for baseline soil reaction, total organic carbon, and metal concentration to allow subsequent monitoring of potential contamination. Deposition of predicted metals in dustfall to soil are calculated in Chapter 18. All predicted total concentrations (predicted plus background) are either below guidelines or within 10% of baseline concentrations. Potential effects of the Project on sensitive soils and mitigation measures are described in Chapter 11 (Assessment of Terrestrial Ecology Effects).
	Potential effects on wetlands	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Proponent will protect wetlands by (among other measures) developing reserve and buffer areas and scheduling work activities during time periods during which risk of effects are minimal (e.g. during the frozen ground period and low water conditions). Potential effects of the Project on wetlands and mitigation measures are described in Chapter 12 (Assessment of Wetlands Effects).
	Potential cumulative effects (e.g., water discharge, water balance, roads)	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN meeting July 13, 2012 WMFN Open House June 6, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	As outlined in Chapter 5 (Effects Assessment Methodology), all project-specific residual effects are carried forward into a cumulative effects assessment.
Economic	Temporary foreign workers (e.g., impacts on local employment opportunities)	SFN, MLIB, WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	MLIB Information Session October 1, 2012 MLIB meeting December 3, 2012 SFN meeting November 22, 2012	The Proponent is working with Northern Lights College to address training needs for underground long-wall mining employment. To be delivered in Tumbler Ridge, this training program will facilitate the transfer of mining jobs to local workers, including local Aboriginal workers, over time. Under the MOU signed, the Proponent and Northern Lights College will: acquire or develop relevant curricula; acquire or develop relevant simulation modules; and identify partners (including Aboriginal groups) for program infrastructure. In addition, the Proponent has committed to a training plan that will transfer employment from temporary foreign workers to local Canadian workers by 10 per cent per year over 10 years. Potential economic effects of the Project and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 14 (Assessment of Economic Effects).
	Opportunities for revenue sharing with Proponent	SFN, MLIB, WMFN	MLIB meeting July 12, 2012 MLIB Information Session October 1, 2012 WMFN meeting May 17, 2013	The Proponent is developing confidential agreements with WMFN, MLIB, and SFN.
	Opportunities for employment and community economic development	MLIB, SFN	MLIB meeting July 12, 2012 MLIB Information Session October 1, 2012 MLIB meeting June 19, 2013 SFN meeting July 13, 2012 WMFN correspondence August 23, 2010 WMFN correspondence July 11, 2011 WMFN meeting May 17, 2013 WMFN meeting September 6, 2012	The Proponent has provided economic benefits to Aboriginal groups through hiring field workers from West Moberly First Nations and Saulteau First Nations and in relation to the development of confidential agreements with West Moberly First Nations, Saulteau First Nations, and the McLeod Lake Indian Band

Appendix 2-E. Summary of Issues, Concerns and Interests Raised by Aboriginal Groups during the Pre-Application Stage

Topic	Summary of Issue, Concern or Interest	Raised by	Source	Proponent Response
Social	Potential social effects due to increased disposable income	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	In response to West Moberly First Nations' concern about the adequacy of its socio-economic baseline data, the Proponent funded an independent socio-economic baseline study for the Nation. The Proponent will supply local service providers with information about expected workforce numbers, as well as indirect and induced employment resulting from the Project to them to plan for increased demand. Potential social effects of the Project and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 15 (Assessment of Social Effects).
	Opportunities for training and apprenticeships	WMFN SFN MLIB	SFN meeting July 13, 2012 SFN meeting November 22, 2012 MLIB Information Session October 1, 2012 WMFN meeting September 6, 2012	The Proponent is working with Northern Lights College to address training needs for underground long-wall mining employment. To be delivered in Tumbler Ridge, this training program will facilitate the transfer of mining jobs to local workers, including local Aboriginal workers, over time. Under the MOU signed, the Proponent and Northern Lights College will: acquire or develop relevant curricula; acquire or develop relevant simulation modules; and identify partners (including Aboriginal groups) for program infrastructure. In addition, the Proponent has committed to a training plan that will transfer employment from temporary foreign workers to local Canadian workers by 10 per cent per year over 10 years.
	Influx of non-local workers and their impact on community services and community safety	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Proponent will provide local service providers with information about expected workforce numbers, as well as indirect and induced employment resulting from the Project to help them to plan for increased demand. Potential social effects of the Project and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 15 (Assessment of Social Effects).
	Funding for new infrastructure	MLIB	MLIB Information Session October 1, 2012	The Application/EIS assesses potential changes on community infrastructure as a result of the Project. The Proponent does not anticipate Project effects on Aboriginal communities' infrastructure. Potential social effects of the Project and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 15 (Assessment of Social Effects).
Land Use	Fishing	MLIB WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL) HLFN	MLIB meeting June 19, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013 HLFN correspondence October 23, 2013	Access to the Murray River for fishing will not be affected by the Project. Potential effects to fish and fish habitat are assessed in Chapter 9 (Assessment of Fish and Fish Habitat Effects). Potential effects of the Project on land use and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 17 (Assessment of Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes Effects).
	Hunting	WMFN SFN MLIB HLFN WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	WMFN meeting June 6, 2013 MLIB meeting June 19, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013 HLFN correspondence October 23, 2013	The Project design will minimize effects to hunting and trapping by creating a small footprint, utilizing already disturbed land, and using existing access roads. The Proponent will address hunting concerns by controlling access through the mine site; implementing no hunting policies for employees and contractors; minimizing effects to wildlife; and maintaining tree buffers around riparian areas and infrastructure, where possible. Potential effects of the Project on land use and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 17 (Assessment of Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes Effects).
	Trapping	MLIB WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL) HLFN	MLIB meeting June 19, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013 HLFN correspondence October 23, 2013	The Project design will minimize effects to hunting and trapping by creating a small footprint, utilizing already disturbed land, and using existing access roads. The Proponent will address hunting concerns by controlling access through the mine site; implementing no hunting policies for employees and contractors; minimizing effects to wildlife; and maintaining tree buffers around riparian areas and infrastructure, where possible. Potential effects of the Project on land use and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 17 (Assessment of Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes Effects).
	Potential effects on gathering activities	HLFN WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	HLFN correspondence October 23, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Project design will minimize effects to gathering activities by creating a small footprint, utilizing already disturbed land, and using existing access roads. Potential effects of the Project on land use and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 17 (Assessment of Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes Effects). Potential effects on harvestable plants are addressed in Chapter 11 (Assessment of Effects on Terrestrial Ecology).
	Spiritual and ceremonial sites, including sacred mountains	HLFN WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	HLFN correspondence October 23, 2013 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	First Nation groups were engaged to support archaeological surveys of the Project footprint. The Proponent will continue to work with First Nations to identify spiritual and ceremonial sites prior to construction activities. Potential effects of the Project on land use and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 17 (Assessment of Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes Effects).
	Potential for visual changes to landscape and water	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Proponent will maintain visual quality objectives outlined in the Dawson Creek Land and Resource Management Plan, including maintaining tree buffers around riparian areas and infrastructure, where possible. Potential effects of the Project on land use and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 16 (Assessment of Land Use Effects) and Chapter 17 (Assessment of Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes Effects).

Appendix 2-E. Summary of Issues, Concerns and Interests Raised by Aboriginal Groups during the Pre-Application Stage

Topic	Summary of Issue, Concern or Interest	Raised by	Source	Proponent Response
Treaty rights	Potential effects of the Project on treaty rights	SFN	SFN comments on dAIR December 20, 2012	The Proponent developed an understanding of Treaty 8 First Nations' treaty rights by reviewing the treaty, consulting with First Nations, conducting research using secondary source materials, and funding a traditional use study for Sauleau First Nations. The Proponent provided Aboriginal groups with a document outlining the Proponent's understanding of each groups' Aboriginal and treaty rights as well as the Proponent's proposed methods for assessing potential effects of the Project on those rights. Aboriginal groups had the opportunity to review the information and to provide comments prior to submission of the Application/EIS. Potential effects of the Project on Aboriginal and treaty rights and related interests and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 20 (Assessment of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Related Interests).
	Potential cumulative effects on treaty rights	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The methods proposed to assess effects of the Project on treaty rights include a cumulative effects assessment. Potential cumulative effects of the Project on Aboriginal and treaty rights and related interests and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 20 (Assessment of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights and Related Interests).
	Need for long-term benefits for First Nations and compensation for impingement on traditional land uses	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The Proponent is developing confidential agreements with WMFN, MLIB, and SFN
Heritage	Ownership of artefacts	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The BC Archaeology Branch determines the list of qualified repositories for curating artifacts in BC. The qualified repository for artifacts recovered during the Murray River Project archaeological studies is the Royal BC Museum in Victoria. This is described in the Heritage Inspection Permit applications for this project. Potential effects of the Project on heritage resources and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 19 (Assessment of Heritage Effects).
	Potential effects on ancient burial sites	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	No burial sites were identified during the Murray River Project archaeological studies. The SFN TUS does not identify any burial sites in the Project footprint or the LSA for Heritage, but identifies one burial site in the LSA for their study. The Proponent will work with SFN prior to construction to identify the burial site and preferred mitigation measures. Potential effects of the Project on heritage resources and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 19 (Assessment of Heritage Effects).
	Potential effects on heritage resources relating to surface facilities	SFN	SFN comments on dAIR December 20, 2012	No heritage sites were identified within any currently proposed surface facilities during the Murray River Project archaeological studies. As such there are no anticipated potential effects on heritage resources related to surface facilities. One archaeological site that was recorded during the studies (site GgRg-9) has been avoided by HD Mining. Potential effects of the Project on heritage resources and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 19 (Assessment of Heritage Effects).
Health	Potential effects on medicinal plants	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	A baseline country foods screening level risk assessment was undertaken to assess the risk to consumers of country foods due to incidental consumption of metals present in country foods. Medicinal plants were not considered specifically, since there is not sufficient information available about the types and amounts of plants consumed, and no samples were collected for metal content analysis; however, berries were included in the risk assessment. No risks to human health were identified in the baseline country foods assessment from the consumption of representative country foods (moose, snowshoe hare, grouse, trout, whitefish, and berries). The quality of country foods was also considered as part of the effects assessment for human health. No predicted residual effects on human health are expected due to the consumption of country foods. This information is described in Chapter 18 (Assessment of Health Effects). Vegetated ecosystems within the LSA have the potential to support medicinal plants. However, the types of medicinal plants and/ or lichens used by local First Nations communities were not available for inclusion into the Application. Nevertheless, Chapter 11 (Assessment of Terrestrial Ecology Effects) provides information regarding the ecological conditions and typical harvestable species for each ecosystem type within the LSA. This information can be used by the relevant First Nations groups to determine potential effects on sites with known medicinal plants.
	Potential effects on human health due to consumption of country foods, including berries, game and fish	SFN WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Most of the vegetated ecosystems within the LSA have the potential to support harvestable plants. As such, the potential loss or alteration of ecosystems may result in effects to harvestable plants. A baseline country foods screening level risk assessment was undertaken to assess the risk to consumers of country foods due to incidental consumption of metals present in country foods. No risks to human health were identified in the baseline country foods assessment from the consumption of representative country foods (moose, snowshoe hare, grouse, trout, whitefish, and berries). The quality of country foods was also considered as part of the effects assessment for human health. No predicted residual effects on human health are expected due to the consumption of country foods. Potential effects of the Project on human health and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 18 (Assessment of Health Effects).

Appendix 2-E. Summary of Issues, Concerns and Interests Raised by Aboriginal Groups during the Pre-Application Stage

Topic	Summary of Issue, Concern or Interest	Raised by	Source	Proponent Response
Health (conf'd)	Potential effects on human health due to contamination of air, drinking water, plants and animals	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Potential effects of the Project on human health and mitigation measures are described in Chapter 18 (Assessment of Health Effects). There were no predicted residual effects on human health due to Project-related changes in air quality, drinking water quality, and country foods quality. Based on the air quality model results, soil quality predictions (based on fugitive dust deposition), and water quality model results, there are no risks to human health expected due to the Project-related changes in air quality, water quality, or country foods quality.
	Potential effects on human health due to accidents and malfunctions	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	PGL Letter to CEA Agency, March 4, 2014	The mine will be operated in a manner that is consistent with the BC Health, Safety and Reclamation Code, and other relevant workplace regulations. These regulations are in place to ensure protection of worker health and safety. Potential effects of the Project related to Accidents and Malfunctions are addressed in Chapter 22.
	Need for resources to support reporting of contaminated game	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	There are no predicted residual effects to human health due to the consumption of country foods. The final analysis and any required mitigation measures are described in Chapter 18 (Assessment of Health Effects) of the Application/EIS. Monitoring of environmental quality (e.g., water quality) is proposed as part of the environmental management plans for the Project. The Proponent will continue to engage with Aboriginal groups about their interests through the EA process and throughout the life of the Project.
	Potential cumulative effects on drinking water	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	Water quality model predictions (Chapter 8), indicate that concentrations of metals and other parameters are below the drinking water quality guidelines or are similar to background concentrations; no risk to human health was identified due to changes in water quality. Since no Project-related residual effects were identified that could affect human health due to drinking water quality, cumulative effects are not expected to occur. Potential effects of the Project on human health and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 18 (Assessment of Health Effects).
	Potential for increased rates of cancers and other diseases in First Nations communities	WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The potential for effects on human health due to Project-related changes in air quality, drinking water quality, and country foods quality were assessed as part of the Application/EIS. Based on the air quality model results, soil quality predictions (based on fugitive dust deposition), and water quality model results, there are no predicted residual effects to human health due to Project-related changes in air quality, water quality, or country foods quality. Potential effects of the Project on human health and mitigation measures are further described in Chapter 18 (Assessment of Health Effects).
	Potential effects on human health and safety due to working conditions	SFN, MLIB, WMFN, SFN, and/or MLIB (presented by PGL)	MLIB meeting June 19, 2013 SFN comments on dAIR December 20, 2012 SFN/WMFN/MLIB scoping meeting April 16, 2013	The mine will be operated in a manner that is consistent with the BC Health, Safety and Reclamation Code, and other relevant workplace regulations. These regulations are in place to ensure protection of worker health and safety.