

PRGT Extension – WG Comments Master Table

	Working Group Member	Category/ Area of Concern	Comment	Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Ltd (PRGT) Response	EAO Response	Working Group Member Follow-up Comment
1	Environment and Climate Change Canada	Disposal at Sea	Given that there have not been any proposed changes to the certified project description, the comments previously submitted by ECCC regarding disposal at sea remain applicable and will need to be addressed if a disposal at sea application is submitted. Guidance is available on ECCC’s disposal at sea website (https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/disposal-at-sea/permit-applicant-guide.html).	PRGT acknowledges the comment from Environment Canada and Climate Change Canada. Should the project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will then take all actions necessary to proceed to construction, including, if required, seeking approval for Disposal at Sea.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	ECCC is satisfied with PRGT’s response.
2	FLNRORD	Cumulative Effects Caribou	Something that would not have been reflected in the EA would be current spruce beetle infestation in the Omineca. With the additional consideration of the spruce beetle infestation, the overall cumulative effects experienced by the several of the VCs contrasts the current state assessed during the EA. Additionally, the certification conditions also reference a Caribou Program, this has now been replaced by the Provincially coordinated caribou program. There would be a clear linkage to between the Condition and the current caribou program.	PRGT acknowledges the comments from FLNRORD. Spruce Beetle As required by Condition 31 to the Environmental Assessment Certificate (EAC), PRGT developed and will implement a Timber Salvage Strategy, which includes the requirement for engaging a Qualified Professional to advise on the steps to be implemented regarding timber management, hauling practices and times to mitigate risk for forest pest spread. As an appendix to the Timber Salvage Strategy, the Construction Forest Health Management Plan (developed by a Qualified Forestry Professional) includes an assessment of hazards and risks associated with forest pests (including spruce beetle), pathogens and damage agents across the project route, including the Mackenzie Natural Resource District. The plan provides management and mitigation strategies to manage these risks. As well, the Plan includes a commitment to consult with forest districts to confirm clearing activities and that mitigation measures remain appropriate for this pest. Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will take all actions necessary to proceed to construction and will consult with the districts in accordance with this commitment. Caribou PRGT acknowledges the new provincially coordinated Caribou Program, and expects that Condition 18 to the EAC, which requires PRGT to enter into an agreement with FLNRORD for a Caribou Program, would apply to the new Program. Should the project proceed, PRGT will continue to engage with FLNRORD on the agreement.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	No further comments.
3	Transport Canada	Permitting	Transport Canada (TC) does not have any comments regarding the EA Certificate extension request for the Prince Rupert Gas Transmission	PRGT acknowledges the comments from Transport Canada.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	Transport Canada had follow-up comments regarding the wording in PRGT’s response.

			<p>project. TC understand that there are no proposed changes to the project.</p> <p>TC previously issued a number of authorizations under the Navigation Protection Act (NPA), for the early work camps up in the Nass area.</p> <p>TC would have more to issue NPA authorizations in the Prince Rupert area should the proponent decide to go ahead and proceed with the proposed project. The pipeline would be going underwater from the Nass Region, Portland Canal, and landing in Prince Rupert where TC would also have to make a determination under s. 67 (projects occurring on federal land) of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012.</p> <p>The pipeline was to run through PRPA (Prince Rupert Port Authority) harbour waters (considered federal waters) when it was originally designed to connect to Pacific Northwest LNG. Because of that, TC was to make a s. 67 Determination. Our understanding is that it was never done because the route was not finalized (Therefore the proponent did not submit NPA approval applications.), and the project was then put on hold. TC would have to confirm the pipeline route.</p>	<p>As a clarification, PRGT has a confirmed pipeline route, which has been assessed through the Environmental Assessment process and included in the Schedule A Certified Project Description to the Environmental Assessment Certificate. It was subsequently permitted by the Oil and Gas Commission (OGC). The permitted route extends from Nasoga Gulf, through Portland Inlet, and ends at Lelu Island. The pipeline does not land in Prince Rupert.</p> <p>PRGT acknowledges that an application for a Section 67 determination under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) was not submitted.</p> <p>Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will take all actions necessary to proceed to construction, including, if required, application(s) under the Navigation Protection Act and CEAA.</p>		<p>PRGT clarified that the pipeline route crosses approximately 7km of federal lands within the Port of Prince Rupert and terminates at Lelu Island and does not intersect the City of Prince Rupert. PRGT acknowledged that they will be submitting applications to Transport Canada, the Prince Rupert Port Authority and potentially to the department of Fisheries and Oceans and Environment and Climate Change Canada which may trigger a CEAA section 67 determination.</p> <p>Transport Canada responded that they have no further questions or comments.</p>
4	Northern Health	New scientific and technical information available since 2014	<p>Since the issuing of EAC # E14-06 on November 25, 2014, Northern Health has further developed the <u>Office of Health and Resource Development</u> to respond to the ever increasing demand for guidance related to the health impacts of resource development in northern BC. Guidance documents and research (including new scientific and technical information) has been compiled since 2014 to improve understandings and responses to health impacts (especially those concerning how health is assessed in EAs, health services, communicable disease planning, the Opioid Overdose Emergency and the social determinants of health impacts in rural and northern communities). Please see our guidance, research, evidence, and resource documents provided on our <u>website</u>. These resources were not available prior to the issuance of the EAC.</p> <p>Similarly, and perhaps more importantly, academic, community, federal and provincial work in this area (e.g. camp impacts on communities, assessing social and health impacts of major projects, gender based analysis, health</p>	<p>PRGT acknowledges the establishment of the Office of Health and Resource Development and the development of new guidance documents.</p> <p>PRGT conducted a comprehensive socio-economic assessment in accordance with Application Information Requirements and maintains that its completed assessment is valid. As a condition of the Environmental Assessment Certificate (EAC), PRGT developed a Socio-Economic Effects Management Plan (SEEMP) in consultation with Aboriginal groups and stakeholders, including Northern Health, which provides for on-going engagement with these groups.</p> <p>The SEEMP includes requirements for discussing and seeking feedback on the effectiveness of implementation of mitigation measures, as well as the identification of any new mitigations. Where mitigation measures have not been effective, or where effects are different from what was assessed, an adaptive management process will be followed.</p> <p>The SEEMP also provides mechanisms for on-going communication and engagement with respect to new information and to address new issues that arise during construction. This flexibility in the SEEMP is responsive to new</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	<p>We are satisfied with PRGT's responses and appreciate the addition of a mitigation to their SEEMP to develop a Health and Medical Services Plan prior to construction, in consultation with Northern Health, in accordance with current guidance and informed by learnings from previous projects. Northern Health looks forward to engaging with PRGT if or when a final investment decision is made with respect to this project.</p>

			<p>impacts associated with accidents and malfunctions, etc.) has advanced significantly in the last 5 years. As a result, Northern Health has observed a more comprehensive approach to how these impacts are being assessed and addressed in more recent EAs which were not evident in the PRGT EA process.</p> <p>Given these advancements in our understanding and ways of addressing and assessing social and health impacts, we question whether it is appropriate to issue an extension to the PRGT project. At the very least, we would like to gain a better understanding of how PRGT will incorporate these new learnings and resources into their effects management plans.</p>	<p>guidance and practices, as they are established. PRGT has committed to addressing and responding to issues as they arise (e.g. opioid crisis, communicable diseases management) to the extent the issue and mitigations are relevant to the Project.</p> <p>PRGT believes the core mitigations identified in the SEEMP, requirements for continued engagement with Northern Health, along with formal processes for issues management, adaptive management and reporting will sufficiently accommodate and address Project specific health care concerns.</p> <p>Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will take all actions necessary to proceed to construction, and looks forward to engaging with Northern Health to identify any new issues and develop any new mitigation measures and to update the SEEMP to incorporate the guidance and resources referenced by Northern Health, as applicable to the Project.</p>		
5	Northern Health	PRINCE RUPERT GAS TRANSMISSION PROJECT (PROJECT), SCHEDULE B, TABLE OF CONDITIONS FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CERTIFICATE	<p>While we recognize that health services are captured as part of a broader socio-economic effects management (SEEMP) condition, there are no conditions which specifically address health services, consultation with Northern Health or requires the development of a Health and Medical Services Plan (HMSP). We ask that the development of a HMSP (which aligns with Northern Health's Health and Medical Services Plan Best Management Guide 2015, Communicable Disease Control Plan - Best Management Guide for Industrial Camps 2017, and Health and Safety During the Opioid Overdose Emergency: Northern Health's Recommendations for Industrial Camps 2018) be a commitment made by PRGT as part of this extension approval. The development of an HMSP not only serves to lessen unnecessary burdens on Northern Health's health care system, but also supports timely and coordinated health care services to PRGT's employees and contractors. Our experiences with numerous other major projects in our region suggests that a coordinated approach to things such as illness/disease prevention, communicable disease management, on-site care, patient transfer (to pre-determined local hospitals), etc. is to everyone's benefit. We have also found it easier to have these targeted plans and conversations related to health service planning outside of the bigger SEEMP conversation. As a result, the development of a HMSP has become a leading practice (and stand-alone standard condition) for projects of this size and nature across the Northern Health region since the EAC was originally issued. Given the</p>	<p>Condition 34 of PRGT's EAC requires the development and implementation of a Social and Economic Effects Management Plan (SEEMP). The condition, in part, outlines requirements for planning and implementation for effective engagement with government agencies regarding effects related to health and social services.</p> <p>PRGT appreciates the significant input provided by Northern Health in the development of the SEEMP. Resulting from this consultation with Northern Health and other stakeholders, the SEEMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outlines specific mitigations related to Health Care Services; • references TransCanada's specific health and safety policies and standards to ensure the well-being of construction workers and nearby communities; • contains core mitigations, including those that would be found in an HMSP; • provides for on-going engagement and consultation with Northern Health to discuss and seek feedback on the effectiveness of implementation of mitigation measures; • provides an adaptive management process to be followed where mitigation measures have not been effective, or where effects are different from what was assessed; • contains a formal issues management process which provides for identification of new issues (e.g. opioid overdose and communicable diseases) and mitigations to address those issues; • provides for reporting throughout construction. <p>PRGT commits to adding a mitigation to its SEEMP to develop a Health and Medical Services Plan prior to construction, in consultation with Northern Health, in accordance with current</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	We are satisfied with PRGT's responses and appreciate the addition of a mitigation to their SEEMP to develop a Health and Medical Services Plan prior to construction, in consultation with Northern Health, in accordance with current guidance and informed by learnings from previous projects. Northern Health looks forward to engaging with PRGT if or when a final investment decision is made with respect to this project.

			<p>above, we strongly recommend that a commitment be made to develop a HMSP as part of the extension approval. It is our understanding that the WCGT project, which has recently sought a similar extension, has committed to this additional request as part of their extension approval.</p>	<p>guidance and informed by learnings from previous projects. PRGT believes the addition of this mitigation, along with core mitigations identified in the SEEMP, TransCanada's health and safety policies and standards, on-going engagement with Northern Health, formal processes for issues management, adaptive management and reporting will sufficiently accommodate and address Project specific health care concerns.</p> <p>Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will continue to engage with Northern Health to develop the HSMP.</p>		
6	Northern Health	<p>PRINCE RUPERT GAS TRANSMISSION PROJECT (PROJECT), SCHEDULE B, TABLE OF CONDITIONS FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CERTIFICATE, Condition 34</p>	<p>As noted above, there have been significant advancements made in the knowledge and guidance available related to the assessment of social and health impacts. We ask that these be incorporated into the development of the SEEMP, including but not limited to information contained on our website, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The social determinants of health impacts of resource extraction and development in rural and northern communities: A summary of impacts and promising practices for assessment and monitoring 2018 - Northern First Nations Caucus Overview of Sub-regional Engagement Sessions - Full Report 2015 	<p>The PRGT Environmental Assessment was a comprehensive assessment that considered key socio-economic effects, including impacts to community infrastructure and services. PRGT's assessment was subject to a robust review by the working group and Aboriginal groups. Through this process, many of the issues included in these documents were raised and discussed in the environmental assessment process.</p> <p>Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will continue to engage with Northern Health to identify any new issues and mitigations that are relevant to the Project, in accordance with the issue management process identified in the SEEMP.</p> <p>Distinct from the SEEMP, PRGT entered into Project Agreements with many Aboriginal groups that provided for economic benefits which could be utilized for community enhancement programs as identified by the Aboriginal group. Similarly, after significant engagement with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities along the project footprint, PRGT invested in various community-based projects and programs aimed at supporting strong communities including investing several million dollars in northern Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal training institutions and programs, and a significant investment in the Upper Skeena Recreation Centre, located in Hazelton, which will provide excellent local access to health and wellness programming for some of the communities most affected by PRGT.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	<p>We are satisfied with PRGT's responses and appreciate the addition of a mitigation to their SEEMP to develop a Health and Medical Services Plan prior to construction, in consultation with Northern Health, in accordance with current guidance and informed by learnings from previous projects. Northern Health looks forward to engaging with PRGT if or when a final investment decision is made with respect to this project.</p>
7	Northern Health	<p>Accidents and Malfunctions</p>	<p>Please describe the need for any updates to emergency response plans and accidents and malfunctions plans since 2014. Given additional learnings, circumstances and experiences since the initial EA (including but not limited to the recent pipeline explosion in Shelley, BC), the plans likely need to be updated and should be protective of public health and reflect Northern Health's new guidance on Northern Health Emergency Roles and Responsibilities. In order to appropriately communicate risks to the public, it is vital that the company's emergency response</p>	<p>Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will then take all actions necessary to proceed to construction, including, and in accordance with commitments made in the Environmental Assessment Application, the SEEMP, and Oil and Gas Commission permit requirements, development of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) for construction, and an ERP for operations. PRGT's plans will be developed (and updated, as required) in accordance with all regulatory requirements. Notification protocols are a key component of ERP's and will include Northern Health, along with local emergency responders, government agencies, Aboriginal groups and</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	<p>We are satisfied with PRGT's responses and appreciate the addition of a mitigation to their SEEMP to develop a Health and Medical Services Plan prior to construction, in consultation with Northern Health, in accordance with current guidance and informed by learnings from previous projects. Northern Health looks forward to engaging with PRGT if or</p>

			plans include appropriate notification protocols and commits to funding appropriate health risk and health impact assessments in the event of an emergency to inform public health responses (e.g. health advisories).	communities. An overview of these plans is provided in Section 36 of PRGT's Application for an Environmental Assessment. PRGT welcomes Northern Health's continued input and is committed to working collaboratively with Northern Health on these plans.		when a final investment decision is made with respect to this project.
8	Northern Health	Human Health Risk Assessments	<p>Since the original EA was completed, new scientific and toxicological information, guidelines, standards and best practices have been released and established in relation to assessing and managing human health effects. For instance, this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQs) - Several new guidance documents from Health Canada: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Health Canada. (2017) Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessments: Air Quality. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/guidance-evaluating-human-health-impacts-air-quality.html o Health Canada. (2017) Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessments: Water Quality. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/guidance-evaluating-human-health-impacts-water-quality.html o Health Canada. (2016) Human Health Risk Assessment for Ambient Nitrogen Dioxide. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/human-health-risk-assessment-ambient-nitrogen-dioxide.html o Guidance for Evaluating Human Health Impacts in Environmental Assessments: Noise. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/healthy-living/guidance-evaluating-human-health-impacts-noise.html <p>We are also aware that the Ministry of Health is working on additional guidance. Based on these advancements, as with the social health impacts, Northern Health has observed an improvement in how health risks are being assessed and addressed in more recent EAs. Again, in light of these advancements in knowledge and process of assessing and addressing human health risks, we question whether it is appropriate to issue an extension to the PRGT project. Again, at the very least, we ask how these advancements will be</p>	<p>PRGT acknowledges that new and/or updated federal standards for assessment of human health effects are now available. PRGT maintains that its completed assessment is valid. PRGT conducted its assessment in accordance with its Application Information Requirements. Project related effects were identified and mitigations for addressing such risks, including air quality, water quality, NO2 and noise were provided. There has been significant consultation and engagement on Project related effects and mitigation. These mitigations have subsequently been included and refined in management plans, including the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and its appendices, Fresh Water Quality Management Plan, Marine Sediment Management and Monitoring Plan, Acid Rock Drainage Management Plan, as well as the SEEMP. It is PRGT's view that these mitigations and PRGT's commitment to meeting all legal and regulatory requirements will sufficiently address human health effects from the Project.</p> <p>It is PRGT's view that the conclusions of the EAO's Assessment Report and the ministerial decision remain valid, and that the new or revised standards for assessment would not alter the outcomes of the original effects assessment.</p> <p>PRGT will continue to engage with Northern Health, and if project-specific health issues arise, the issues management process contained in the SEEMP can be utilized to discuss and address such issues.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	We are satisfied with PRGT's responses and appreciate the addition of a mitigation to their SEEMP to develop a Health and Medical Services Plan prior to construction, in consultation with Northern Health, in accordance with current guidance and informed by learnings from previous projects. Northern Health looks forward to engaging with PRGT if or when a final investment decision is made with respect to this project.

			incorporated into PRGT's project design, permitting and management plans.			
9	Metlakatla	No longer any associated facility with pipeline	<p>A number of changes of circumstance have occurred. One example is that there is no longer any associated facility with the project.</p> <p>Could the EAO provide information on the potential pipeline certificate extension given that there is no associated facility with the project?</p>	N/A	<p>The Prince Rupert Gas Transmission project (Project) received Environmental Assessment Certificate #E14-06 (EAC) on November 25, 2014. The Project and the Pacific NorthWest LNG (PNW LNG) facility were assessed separately as two distinct projects, and as such received two separate EACs. Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Ltd. (PRGT) is requesting an extension of the EAC and is not requesting changes to the Certified Project Description at this time; the size and length of the proposed pipeline and terminus location will all remain the same. If commercial agreements result in changes in to the Project Description, PRGT would need to apply for an amendment to the EAC.</p>	
10	Metlakatla	New moratorium on Flora Bank development	<p>Though the project does not run along Flora Bank, without proper management the pipe laying/construction activities could have impacts to Flora Bank (e.g. increased sedimentation). How will the new PRPA development moratorium for Flora Bank impact the project's planned activities?</p>	<p>PRGT is now aware of the proposed moratorium on Flora, Agnew and Horsey Banks recently announced by the Prince Rupert Port Authority (PRPA). PRGT has not yet been consulted on the proposed moratorium which would be formalized in PRPA's Land Use Management Plan. We understand that at this time, PRPA supports the extension request for the environmental assessment certificate for PRGT and that PRPA will continue to work with TransCanada in considering opportunities to accommodate PRGT's permitted final alignment in consideration of future development opportunities, PRPA sustainability initiatives and the land use plan.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with the PRGT's response.</p>	
11	Metlakatla	Cumulative Effects	<p>Throughout the Environmental Assessment process and in a letter to the ministers at the conclusion of the EA, Metlakatla identified to the EAO issues surrounding the lack of a proper cumulative effect's assessment. Despite requests made by Metlakatla, no attempt was made by the province to work with Metlakatla to come up with solutions. Metlakatla recommends a proper cumulative effects assessment be carried out for each of the project's valued components.</p>	N/A	<p>Metlakatla First Nation raised its concern about the cumulative effects assessment during review of the Application. This concern was raised by other Aboriginal groups as well and was addressed in section 16.5 of the BC EAO Assessment Report.</p> <p>The section 11 order issued for each new reviewable project requires the proponent to conduct a cumulative effects assessment considering effects from existing and reasonably foreseeable projects, as was conducted by PRGT in its application.</p> <p>Conditions in the EAC require mitigation of project specific impacts, which thereby reduces the project's contribution to cumulative effects.</p>	
12	Metlakatla	Cumulative Effects (2)	<p>There are no project conditions in the EAC related to cumulative effects. Independent of project conditions, what commitments has the proponent made related to cumulative effects identification, monitoring, mitigation (including for marine and socio-economic values)?</p>	<p>Project-related effects are addressed through the implementation of mitigation measures that are provided in several management plans, developed in consultation with Aboriginal groups and government agencies. Implementation of mitigation measures within the plans will reduce Project-related effects and the project's contribution to cumulative effects.</p> <p>Many of the plans require monitoring during construction to ensure that mitigation measures are effective. For example,</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with the PRGT's response.</p>	

				<p>Condition 5, Marine Access and Traffic Management Plan Condition 6, Fisheries Interaction Plan Condition 7, Marine Mammal Monitoring Plan Condition 8, Crab Movement Mitigation and Monitoring Plan Condition 9, Marine Sediment Management and Monitoring Plan Condition 36, Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) Condition 40, Construction Monitoring Program for Aboriginal groups</p> <p>In addition, Condition 36 for the CEMP requires a post-construction monitoring program and includes adaptive management strategies to mitigate any potential issues identified during post-construction monitoring. PRGT has developed a CEMP for the Terrestrial Pipeline and one for the Marine Ancillary Facilities. A CEMP specific to marine pipeline construction will be developed in consultation with Aboriginal groups and regulatory agencies prior to construction in the marine environment.</p> <p>For socio-economic values, the Socio-Economic Effects Management Plan (SEEMP) provides for on-going engagement and consultation with Aboriginal groups and stakeholders to discuss and seek feedback on the effectiveness of implementation of mitigation measures, as well as the identification of new issues and mitigations to address those issues. PRGT has committed to addressing and responding to issues through a formal issues management process which provides for identification and resolution of issues as they arise during construction, and the implementation of effective mitigations based on effects that may be occurring or anticipated at the time.</p> <p>Through the implementation of these and other Plans, compliance with permit conditions, on-going engagement with Aboriginal groups and stakeholders, along with post-construction monitoring and adaptive management where required, the contribution of Project-related effects to cumulative effects will be addressed.</p> <p>PRGT welcomes Metlakatla's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Metlakatla.</p>		
13	Metlakatla	Cumulative Effects (3)	<p>Since the EAC was issued, many new projects have been proposed (some have started construction) in the surrounding region including on Ridley and Watson Island. Some key projects include the Pembina propane export terminal (Watson Island and Porpoise Harbour), RTI berth expansion (Ridley Island), Vopak Pacific Canada (Ridley Island), Wolverine Terminals (Prince Rupert Inner and Outer Harbour), Fairview Phase 2B expansion, Fairview to Ridley Island Connector Rd Project, CN</p>	N/A	<p>The Project has been an existing project since the issuance of the EAC that was required by all subsequent development proposals to be taken into consideration in their assessment of cumulative impacts. The EAO notes that several major projects that have since been cancelled were considered as part of the Project's cumulative effects assessment.</p> <p>The EAO's view is that the scope of the assessment for the Project's environmental assessment (EA) was appropriate</p>	

			<p>siding projects and twinning of Zanardi Bridge. At least three of these projects are proposing to do Disposal at Sea.</p> <p>Given that the projected industrial development for the project area is high, there are concerns that the cumulative effect landscape has changed since issuance of the EAC. These new and additional projects could impact the conclusions reached in the certificate and cumulative effects need to be properly assessed and mitigated.</p>		<p>to consider cumulative effects and develop meaningful measures to mitigate any potential adverse effects (section 3.1.1 of the section 11 Order issued for PRGT). Consistent with Section 11(2)(b) of the BC Environmental Assessment Act, this has been a standard requirement for every project entering an EA. The EAO guidance on conducting assessments of cumulative effects at the time of the EA required the consideration of all past, present and potential future activities. BC government's updated cumulative effects framework interim policy continues this approach.</p> <p>On page 6 of Reasons for Ministers' Decision document, the Ministers specifically identified "cumulative effects within asserted territories" as a particular concern considered in their decision, and stipulated:</p> <p>"A number of the legally binding conditions are a result of EAO's consideration of comments from Aboriginal Groups, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued access to harvest medicinal and food source plants, traditional use activities and trap lines; • Information sharing on the future regulatory requirements, construction and operations • Cultural awareness training for the Proponent's personnel; • Opportunities to participate in construction monitoring; and • Continued consultation obligations" <p>The EAO notes these include conditions #23, 39, and 40.</p> <p>The EAO is of the view that while these concerns remain, they are not a change in circumstance since the original environmental assessment. The EAO is available to discuss these responses with Metlakatla and any outstanding concerns.</p>	
14	Metlakatla	Baseline Assessments and management plans	<p>A number of baseline assessments and management plans remain incomplete including a full archaeological impact assessment and a comprehensive fish habitat offsetting plan.</p>	<p>PRGT completed all baseline assessments in its EAC application as required in the Application Information Requirements. Additional supplemental filings were prepared where additional requests occurred through the assessment process. Baseline assessments were also completed for amendments to the EAC. In addition to the environmental assessment, PRGT also gathered additional information to support permit applications and to meet Oil and Gas Commission (OGC) conditions.</p> <p>As outlined in its EAC Extension application, PRGT has completed and received approval or acceptance for most of the required management plans. The remaining management plans will be developed in consultation with Aboriginal groups and regulatory agencies and submitted for approval or acceptance to the EAO prior to commencement of construction.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with the PRGT's response.</p>	

				<p>Archaeology: As part of the EAC application requirements, PRGT completed an Archaeological Overview Assessment (AOA). This overview assessment identified high potential areas for heritage resources which required further study. In addition, OGC issued conditions for PRGT to complete Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIA's). To date, PRGT has completed AIA's for more than 95% of the pipeline route, including all of the Project footprint within Metlakatla Traditional Territory. PRGT has provided Metlakatla with all the Interim AIA's for areas within Metlakatla's Traditional Territory.</p> <p>Fish Habitat Offset Plan: PRGT developed and consulted on a Conceptual Fish Habitat Offsetting Plan as part of its EAC Application. As outlined in the Conceptual Plan, PRGT is committed to engaging with affected Aboriginal groups, interested parties, and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) to identify watercourse and site-specific mitigation and offsetting prior to submission of an application to DFO for a Section 35(2)(b) Authorization. To date, no applications have been submitted to DFO.</p> <p>Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will resume work to complete the remaining AIA to satisfy the OGC condition, and will complete its detailed construction planning and marine pipeline planning, which will inform further permitting (e.g. under the Fisheries Act). Should any fisheries authorizations be required, PRGT will develop detailed fisheries offset plans in consultation with DFO and Aboriginal groups, as outlined in the Conceptual Fish Habitat Offsetting Plan.</p> <p>PRGT welcomes Metlakatla's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Metlakatla.</p>		
15	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Environmental Assessment Legislation	Since the Project's environmental assessment was conducted in 2014, proponents, regulators, environmental assessment practitioners, and Indigenous Nations have gained numerous insights into best practices for environmental assessment, as well as Aboriginal consultation, in keeping with current science, traditional knowledge and case law. Additionally, in 2018, Premier John Horgan committed to implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. These insights and political shifts have informed the new Environmental Assessment Act (Bill 51). As this Act will likely be in force before the Project's Environmental Assessment Certificate expires in 2019, and as new environmental assessment legislation represents a	N/A	The Province is committed to adopting and implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). As you note, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy received a mandate letter from Premier Horgan on July 18, 2017 that notes that the Province will fully adopt and implement UNDRIP and the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Bill 51 was given royal assent on November 27, 2019. The new Environmental Assessment Act, S.B.C. 2018, c. 51 (the new Act) is anticipated to be brought into force later in 2019, after the development of necessary key regulations and policies. The Province has been clear that the new Act applies only to new projects going forward and does not "reach back" to previous project decisions. In addition, Projects currently under assessment under the current EA Act will	

			<p>material change to circumstances since the original environmental assessment that could impact conclusions reached in the certificate, Gitxaala requires that the extension request not be approved. Instead, the Project must be assessed under new provincial legislation and in accordance with current best practices for environmental assessment, including recognition of UNDRIP</p>		<p>continue under the existing process, with practical transition provisions.</p> <p>The Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Project (Project) has already received an environmental assessment certificate under the current Environmental Assessment Act, S.B.C. 2002, c.43 (current Act), and since it has not been constructed the extension is required under the current Act. The new Act is not yet in force but when it is, environmental assessment certificates received under the current Act will remain valid. The new Act does not retroactively take away or require the reassessment of environmental assessment certificates already granted. However, provisions of the new Act that apply to existing certificate holders, such as compliance and enforcement or rights to terminate certificates, will also apply to a project with an existing environmental assessment certificate.</p> <p>While it is not possible to go back and incorporate UNDRIP into the EA, the EAO is incorporating the principles of UNDRIP into the review of this extension request by being open to collaboration with First Nations and attempting to reach consensus on conclusions.</p>	
16	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and BC Climate Planning	<p>Since 2014, considerable research has been conducted worldwide regarding the adverse effects of increased greenhouse gas emissions and associated adverse impacts of climate change, which has influenced government policy in BC. Specifically, in May 2018, the Province updated BC's emission reduction targets to 40% by 2030, 60% by 2040, and 80% by 2050.* The Project Application does not consider these targets, including in relation to the positive final investment decision for the LNG Canada project. Gitxaala requires that the Project extension request not be approved, as the Application does not assess greenhouse gas emissions from the standpoint of current climate science or the Province's emission reduction targets, both of which are material changes in circumstances since the original environmental assessment was conducted that could impact conclusions in the certificate. Further, the Application does not consider the impacts of climate change stemming from Project-related greenhouse gas emissions, including upstream emissions, on Gitxaala Nation. We note that Gitxaala's main reserve is located on an island that has the potential to be significantly adversely impacted by sea level rise and increased extreme weather events, as a result of global warming. *British Columbia. 2018. Climate Planning & Action. Retrieved from</p>	<p>PRGT acknowledges that BC has updated its emissions targets. PRGT conducted a quantitative GHG assessment in accordance with the Application Information Requirements. The estimated emissions have not changed from that assessed in the Application. PRGT also developed a GHG Management Plan outlining mitigations to manage and reduce GHG's that was accepted by the EAO.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response. The EAO notes that the changing context for climate change and the management of GHG emissions would not change the conclusions in the EAO's Assessment Report that the Project would have a significant residual adverse effect on GHG emissions.</p>	

			https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/climate-change/planning-and-action			
17	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Project Description	<p>The Project Description in the Application states that the Project is “intended to provide sweet natural gas from a point near Hudson’s Hope, to the proposed Pacific NorthWest LNG natural gas liquefaction and export facility (PNW LNG) near Prince Rupert, at Lelu Island, within the District of Port Edward” * This statement is no longer accurate, as there are currently no LNG terminals being proposed at Lelu Island.</p> <p>The federal environmental assessment process for the Prince Rupert LNG Project, which was proposed for Ridley Island, was terminated in 2017.</p> <p>The absence of a proposal for an LNG facility to receive the WCGT pipeline represents a material change that has occurred since the environmental assessment took place that impacts the EAO’s assessment, specifically the justification for the project, and could impact conclusions reached in the certificate. Additionally, the cumulative effects assessment in the Application is no longer valid, as the size and activities of a receiving LNG facility on Ridley Island have changed (as have proposed developments in the area, which is discussed in the next section). Furthermore, as described in Gitxaala’s submissions during the assessment process, the Project must be assessed in conjunction with the associated LNG facility. Failure to do so amounts to project splitting and an attempt to minimize the adverse impacts of the Project, which, in our view, include impacts from shipping within Gitxaala Territory and greenhouse gas emissions from the LNG facility and upstream LNG production. The certificate extension must not be granted, as the Project Description and the resulting environmental assessment have materially changed.</p> <p>*Stantec Environmental Consultants. 2014. Environmental Assessment Certificate Application, p. 1 Retrieved from https://projects.eao.gov.bc.ca/p/prince-rupert-gas-transmission/docs</p> <p>**Government of Canada. 2017. Prince Rupert LNG Project. Retrieved from https://www.ceaaacee.gc.ca/050/evaluations/proj/80042?culture=en-CA.</p>	N/A	<p>The Project received Environmental Assessment Certificate #E14-06 (EAC) on November 25, 2014. The Project and the Pacific NorthWest LNG (PNW LNG) facility were assessed separately as two distinct projects, and as such received two separate EACs. PRGT is requesting an extension of the EA Certificate and is not requesting changes to the Certified Project Description at this time; the size and length of the proposed pipeline and terminus location will all remain the same. If commercial agreements result in changes in to the Certified Project Description, PRGT would need to apply for an amendment to the EAC. The EAO is satisfied that despite this changed circumstance, a potential approval of the extension request would not constitute a material change that has not otherwise been considered and appropriately addressed during the original EA and the TOC.</p> <p>The EAO acknowledges Gitxaala’s submission to the Ministers’ on the Project and confirms that the Ministers’ reasons for decision on the Project acknowledges their consideration of Gitxaala’s submission. The EAO’s guidance on Requesting an EA Certificate Extension states, “When considering a request, the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) considers such things as the rationale for requiring an extension, the certificate holder’s compliance record, and new or changed potential significant adverse effects.” EA Certificate extension applications are not an opportunity to revisit issues that were already raised and addressed. The EAO is of the view that while these concerns remain, they are not a change in circumstance since the original environmental assessment.</p>	
18	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Cumulative Effects	<p>Since 2014, there have been material changes to the industrial activities within the Chatham Sound and Ridley Island areas, where the proposed pipeline runs through Gitxaala Territory. For example, on Ridley Island alone, new projects include the AltaGas propane storage facility (under construction), the</p>	<p>PRGT maintains that the assessment of cumulative effects in the application is valid. PRGT conducted its assessment in accordance with EAO guidance and the Application Information Requirements. The assessment included reasonably foreseeable projects and activities that had been publicly announced.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with the PRGT’s response.</p>	

			<p>Ridley Terminals Inc. berth expansion (under review), and the Vopak propane storage and export facility (under review). Vessel traffic in the Project area has likely increased, as well. As a result, the assessments of cumulative effects in the Application are no longer accurate or valid. Any proposed mitigations regarding cumulative effects in the Project area do not take developments proposed and/or constructed after 2014 into account. Gitxaala requires that the Project be reassessed to account for interactions with new developments within or planned for the Chatham Sound and Ridley Island area.</p>	<p>Projects assessed and approved after the issuance of PRGT's EAC were required to address their potential cumulative effects where there was overlap with the PRGT Project. In addition, several major projects that were considered as part of the PRGT's cumulative effects assessment have since been cancelled.</p> <p>Mitigations provided in the Application and management plans required to satisfy an EAC condition will reduce Project-related effects and remain relevant to minimize the Project's contribution to cumulative effects.</p> <p>PRGT welcomes Gitxaala's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Gitxaala on the remaining marine management plans to further address concerns.</p>		
19	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Baseline Data	<p>In our view, the baseline data collected to inform the assessment is no longer valid. For example, current conditions of water quality, sediment quality, eelgrass, crabs, kelp, benthic invertebrates, fish, and other components of the nearshore and offshore marine environment may have materially changed since baseline studies were conducted more than four years ago. As the baseline data is no longer valid, the original environmental assessment and conclusions reached in the certificate are no longer valid. Gitxaala therefore recommends that the certificate not be extended.</p>	<p>PRGT does not believe baseline conditions have changed materially; furthermore, there have been no new major projects undertaken along the marine pipeline route that would materially change the baseline conditions. As such, additional baseline data collection is not warranted as it would not alter the outcomes of the original effects assessment. Baseline studies conducted for the environmental assessment were robust and provided a strong understanding of the existing environment. The assessment methods considered construction, operation and decommissioning activities and how these activities interact with the existing environment, the mitigation measures PRGT will implement, and made conclusions on the residual effects that were likely to occur. This is a scientifically defensible approach based on guidance developed by the BC EAO and industry best practice.</p> <p>It is PRGT's view that the conclusions of the EAOs Assessment Report and the ministerial decision remains valid today, and that additional baseline work would not alter the outcomes of the original effects assessment.</p> <p>PRGT welcomes Gitxaala's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Gitxaala on the remaining marine management plans to further address concerns.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with the PRGT's response.	
20	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Environmental Assessment Methodology	<p>Gitxaala is concerned that industry standards for environmental assessment, as well as guidelines and legislation related to specific Valued Components (e.g. water quality, sediment quality, air quality, and species at risk) have materially changed since the original environmental assessment was completed. At minimum, Gitxaala requires that Enbridge provide a report to the Nation that determines whether the environmental assessment methods and tools used in the original assessment, as well as the guidelines</p>	<p>PRGT conducted its Environmental Assessment pursuant to "The Environmental Assessment Act, SBC 2002, c 43" which remains in force today. PRGT recognizes that the new Environmental Assessment Act, enacted in Bill 51 is not yet in force. Further, the new Act contains transitional provisions deeming an environmental assessment certificate issued under the 2002 Act to be continued under the proposed Act (section 78). As a result, even if the proposed Act were in force today, it would not apply to the EA Certificate for the PRGT Project.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment Act, SBC 2002, c 43, its regulations and the assessment process have not changed since the EAO issued the EAC for the Project on November 25, 2014. The new Environmental Assessment Act enacted in Bill 51 is not yet in force. It contains transitional provisions deeming an environmental assessment certificate issued under the 2002 Act to be continued under the proposed Act (section 78). Further if an</p>	

			and legislation referenced in the original assessment, are still relevant. Enbridge must indicate if assessment methods, tools, guidelines and/or legislation have been updated since the assessment was completed.	PRGT believes its assessment remains valid. Subsequent to receiving its EAC, PRGT has developed a number of management plans which have further refined mitigation measures to minimize Project-related effects. PRGT welcomes Gitxaala's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Gitxaala on the remaining marine management plans to further address concerns.	assessment is started under the 2002 Act when the proposed Act comes into force, the assessment may be continued under the 2002 Act. As a result, even if the proposed Act were in force today, it would not apply to the EA Certificate for the PRGT Project. PRGT will be required to comply with current regulations, guidelines and legislation going forward into permitting, planning, and construction. This will be reflected in various management plans developed in consultation with First Nations, as required in Schedule B of the EAC.	
21	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Assessment of Potential Impacts on Gitxaala's Aboriginal Interests	Gitxaala's concerns with the lack of meaningful assessment of potential impacts of the Project on the Nation were never adequately addressed. These concerns are outlined in Gitxaala's submission to the Minister and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to assess Gitxaala's Valued Components; • Inappropriate focus on biophysical elements; • Inappropriate assumptions regarding the transferability of Traditional Uses; • Flawed approach to cumulative effects; • Misuse of Gitxaala's information; • Failure to properly consider socio-economic impacts; • Failure to adequately identify and assess mitigation measures; and • Concerns about impacts related to Transportation.* Of note, socioeconomic and traditional use reports completed and submitted for the Project were not adequately integrated into the Application or the Province's Assessment Report. Gitxaala remains concerned with these issues and, therefore, does not support the request for a certificate extension. As part of the extension request, the Crown must review Gitxaala Nation's submission to the Ministers and address any outstanding concerns related to inadequacy of the assessment of potential impacts on Gitxaala's Aboriginal Interests. *Gitxaala Nation. 2014. Gitxaala Nation Submissions to the Ministers on the Proposed Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Project. Retrieved from https://projects.eao.gov.bc.ca/p/prince-rupert-gas-transmission/docs	N/A	The EAO acknowledges Gitxaala's submission to the Ministers' on the Project and confirms that the Ministers' reasons for decision on PRGT acknowledges their consideration of Gitxaala's submission. The EAO acknowledges that Gitxaala's final Socio-economic and Traditional Land Use Reports were not provided within the proponent's designated timeframe and therefore were not included in their Application. The final reports (Gitxaala Use Study and Gitxaala Nation Socio-Economic Report) were provided to the EAO on September 25, 2014, as well as the Gitxaala Valued Components Report. These reports were reviewed and considered in the EAO's assessment of potential impacts of the proposed Project on Gitxaala's Aboriginal Interests, and they are cited frequently in the EAO's Assessment Report. The EAO is available to discuss these responses with Gitxaala and any outstanding concerns.	
22	Gitxaala Environmental Monitoring	Consultation Process	In its submission to the Minister in 2014, Gitxaala also identified numerous concerns regarding the Crown's breach of the duty to consult and accommodate. The Crown failed to properly assess Gitxaala Nation's strength of claim in the Prince Rupert Harbour area, failed to allow adequate time for adequate consultation, and failed to approach consultation with an open mind and in good faith.*	N/A	The EAO acknowledges Gitxaala's submission to the Ministers' on the Project and confirms that the Ministers' reasons for decision on the Project acknowledges their consideration of Gitxaala's submission. The EAO is aware of Gitxaala's concerns regarding adequacy of consultation and accommodation and the EAO's assessment of the strength of Gitxaala's claims of Aboriginal rights and title to the Prince Rupert Harbour area, which were articulated in	

			<p>These concerns remain. The Crown must review Gitxaala Nation's submission to the Ministers and address any outstanding concerns related to inadequacy of the consultation process, as part of the extension request. *Gitxaala Nation. 2014. Gitxaala Nation Submissions to the Ministers on the Proposed Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Project. Retrieved from https://projects.eao.gov.bc.ca/p/prince-rupert-gas-transmission/docs</p>		<p>the EAO's Assessment Report. The EAO is of the view that while these concerns remain, a potential approval of the extension request would not constitute a material change that has not otherwise been considered and appropriately addressed during the original EA and the TOC. The EAO is available to discuss these responses with Gitxaala and any outstanding concerns.</p>	
23	Gitxsan – Kispiox	Certificate validity	<p>BC has committed to honoring UNDRIP and calls to action of TRC. We need to re-examine all original data on Gitxsan Laxyip during original engagement.</p>	N/A	<p><i>SENT</i></p> <p>The Province is committed to adopting and implementing the <i>United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</i> (UNDRIP). As you note, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy received a mandate letter from Premier Horgan on July 18, 2017 that notes that the Province will fully adopt and implement UNDRIP and the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Bill 51 was given royal assent on November 27, 2019. The new <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>, S.B.C. 2018, c. 51 (the new Act) is anticipated to be brought into force later in 2019, after the development of necessary key regulations and policies. The Province has been clear that the new Act applies only to new projects going forward and does not “reach back” to previous project decisions. In addition, Projects currently under assessment under the current EA Act will continue under the existing process, with practical transition provisions.</p> <p>The Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Project has already received an environmental assessment certificate under the current Environmental Assessment Act, S.B.C. 2002, c.43 (current Act), and since it has not been constructed the extension is required under the current Act. The new Act is not yet in force but when it is, environmental assessment certificates received under the current Act will remain valid. The new Act does not retroactively take away or require the reassessment of environmental assessment certificates already granted. However, provisions of the new Act that apply to existing certificate holders, such as compliance and enforcement or rights to terminate certificates, will also apply to a project with an existing environmental assessment certificate.</p> <p>While it is not possible to go back and incorporate UNDRIP into the EA, the EAO is incorporating the principles of UNDRIP into the review of this extension request by being open to collaboration with First Nations and attempting to reach consensus on conclusions.</p>	
24	Nak'azdli Whut'en	New EA legislation	<p>Incorporate the new/upcoming legislative changes to this project; this EA application</p>	<p>PRGT is required to comply with applicable legislation, regulations and permit requirements. Prior to commencing</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.</p>	

		implementation		<p>construction, PRGT will ensure that any changes in requirements due to changing legislation or regulations will be reflected in updates to management plans.</p> <p>PRGT welcomes Nak'azdli Whut'en's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Nak'azdli Whut'en on any updates to the plans.</p>	<p>The Province is committed to adopting and implementing the <i>United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</i> (UNDRIP). As you note, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy received a mandate letter from Premier Horgan on July 18, 2017 that notes that the Province will fully adopt and implement UNDRIP and the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Bill 51 was given royal assent on November 27, 2019. The new <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>, S.B.C. 2018, c. 51 (the new Act) is anticipated to be brought into force later in 2019, after the development of necessary key regulations and policies. The Province has been clear that the new Act applies only to new projects going forward and does not "reach back" to previous project decisions. In addition, Projects currently under assessment under the current EA Act will continue under the existing process, with practical transition provisions.</p> <p>Prince Rupert Gas Transmission (Project) has already received an environmental assessment certificate (EAC) under the current Environmental Assessment Act, S.B.C. 2002, c.43 (current Act), and since it has not been constructed the extension is required under the current Act. The new Act is not yet in force but when it is, environmental assessment certificates received under the current Act will remain valid. The new Act does not retroactively take away or require the reassessment of environmental assessment certificates already granted. However, provisions of the new Act that apply to existing certificate holders, such as compliance and enforcement or rights to terminate certificates, will also apply to a project with an existing environmental assessment certificate.</p> <p>While it is not possible to go back and incorporate UNDRIP into the EA, the EAO is incorporating the principles of UNDRIP into the review of this extension request by being open to collaboration with First Nations and attempting to reach consensus on conclusions.</p>	
25	Nak'azdli Whut'en	Consent Required	Nak'azdli Whut'en have not provided Free, Prior and Informed Consent for the Project. No Agreements are in place with the Proponent or the Province for the PRGT project.	Should the project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will resume engagement with the Nak'azdli Whut'en to identify potential impacts of Project activities on the community's values and needs in order to find mutually acceptable solutions and benefits.	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the Province is committed to adopting and implementing UNDRIP, including the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent. However, the Province has been clear that the new Act, which includes supporting the implementation of UNDRIP, applies only to new projects going forward and does not retroactively take away or require the reassessment of environmental assessment certificates already granted. The Ministers' Reasons for Decision on the Project EA states that they "are satisfied that the Province has fulfilled</p>	

					its obligations for consultation and accommodation to Aboriginal Groups".	
					While it is not possible to go back and incorporate UNDRIP into the original EA, the EAO is incorporating the principles of UNDRIP into the review of this extension request by being open to collaboration with First Nations and attempting to reach consensus on conclusions.	
26	Nak'azdli Whut'en	Watershed concerns – Inzana Lake, Nation River	<p>We've provided information to the original EA about Inzana Lake Watershed (among other watersheds) and the need for an independent watershed assessment of how the project may impact the area and what mitigation measures/avoidance areas we see fit. We can do the watershed assessment and/or direct an independent study (at the proponent's cost)</p>	<p>PRGT acknowledges that Nak'azdli Whut'en expressed concerns regarding the pipeline route and impacts to creeks and rivers. PRGT routed to avoid as many water course crossings as possible, and worked closely with the Nak'azdli Whut'en to make route changes to address Nak'azdli Whut'en's concerns, including route alternatives for Nation River and Sasklo Dome that were included in the July 2014 Addendum to the Application.</p> <p>PRGT assessed a number of Valued Components (VC) relative to watersheds including freshwater aquatic resources, water quality, hydrology and wetlands. Each VC included a Local Assessment Area (LAA) to assess project related effects and an Regional Assessment Area (RAA) for the broader context of assessing significance of project related effects overlapping with other reasonably foreseeable Project's effects in the region. Notably, the RAA for freshwater quality included all watersheds overlapped by the Project. The RAA for freshwater aquatics, hydrology and wetlands range up to 1 km from the pipeline. PRGT believes the assessment is robust and the mitigations provided will avoid or reduce Project-related effects, and their contribution to cumulative effects on the watershed.</p> <p>Following receipt of the EAC, PRGT developed and engaged with Nak'azdli Whut'en on plans required to satisfy conditions in its EAC. Those plans that are relevant to mitigating impacts to waterways, including watersheds, include the Construction Environment Management Plan and the Wetland Management Plan. PRGT welcomes Nak'azdli Whut'en's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Nak'azdli Whut'en on any updates to the plans.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
27	Nak'azdli Whut'en	Funding resources	Community engagement and further review needed. The original EA did not require the proponent to engage the community thoroughly, there were a number of concerns not addressed through the time/resource limited process.	PRGT has engaged with Nak'azdli Whut'en throughout the Project. PRGT acknowledges that Nak'azdli Whut'en expressed concerns regarding the pipeline route and impacts to creeks and rivers. PRGT made route changes to address these concerns, including route alternatives for crossing the Nation River and Sasklo Dome that were included in the July 2014 Addendum to the Application. PRGT had agreed to additional meetings with affected Keyoh holders regarding routing near Hatdudatehl Lake and Sasklo Dome/Ridge. PRGT remains committed to discussing and considering micro-routing changes within the Certified Project Corridor to address concerns with	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	

				these areas, if such changes are technically and economically feasible. Should the project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will resume engagement with Nak'azdli Whut'en on these areas.		
28	Luutkudziiwus	Consultation, Cumulative Effects	Lack of consultation with Luutkudziiwus issues, which are currently outstanding and impacting our rights and title if not resolved with the Crown. These current issues are linked to the past infringement of rights due to cumulative adverse effects to our fish abundance and their habitats, our cultural heritage infrastructure, our wildlife abundance and habitats, and our forest and plant communities, which have been severely reduced, particularly cedar – a cultural necessity; all of these resources that are critical to cultural survival are also being impacted by global warming and climate change on the local scale.	N/A	<p>The EAO acknowledges Luutkudziiwus concerns with consultation. The Assessment Report for Prince Rupert Gas Transmission (Project) notes that the EAO met directly with Gitksan <i>wilp</i> and <i>huwilp</i>, including Luutkudziiwus, throughout the EA process to discuss issues. The Assessment Report also notes that communications were challenging with Gitksan, and consultation was further complicated by the “complex nature of the internal dynamics of the Nation, including lack of clarity regarding governance structures and disputes related to wilp boundaries and Simgiigyet representation”. Issues raised by Luutkudziiwus are reflected in conditions required by Environmental Assessment Certificate #E14-06 (EAC). Schedule B of the EAC requires PRGT to consult with First Nations on the development of various management plans required in these conditions, thereby ensuring ongoing consultation. The Ministers’ Reasons for Decision on the Project environmental assessment (EA) states that they “are satisfied that the Province has fulfilled its obligations for consultation and accommodation to Aboriginal Groups”.</p> <p>The Project has been an existing project since the issuance of the EAC that was required by all subsequent development proposals to be taken into consideration in their assessment of cumulative impacts. The EAO notes that several major projects that have since been cancelled were considered as part of the Project’s cumulative effects assessment.</p> <p>The EAO’s view is that the scope of the assessment for the Project EA was appropriate to consider cumulative effects and develop meaningful measures to mitigate any potential adverse effects (section 3.1.1 of the section 11 Order issued for PRGT). Consistent with Section 11(2)(b) of the BC Environmental Assessment Act, this has been a standard requirement for every project entering an EA. The EAO guidance on conducting assessments of cumulative effects at the time of the EA required the consideration of all past, present and potential future activities. BC government’s updated cumulative effects framework interim policy continues this approach.</p> <p>On page 6 of Reasons for Ministers’ Decision document, the Ministers specifically identified “cumulative effects within asserted territories” as a particular concern considered in their decision, and stipulated:</p>	

					<p>“A number of the legally binding conditions are a result of EAO’s consideration of comments from Aboriginal Groups, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued access to harvest medicinal and food source plants, traditional use activities and trap lines; • Information sharing on the future regulatory requirements, construction and operations; • Cultural awareness training for the Proponent’s personnel; • Opportunities to participate in construction monitoring; and • Continued consultation obligations” <p>The EAO notes these include conditions #23, 39, and 40.</p> <p>The EAO is of the view that while these concerns remain, they are not a change in circumstance since the original environmental assessment. The EAO is available to discuss these responses with Luutkudziiwus and any outstanding concerns.</p>	
29	Luutkudziiwus	Jurisdictional Issues	<p>Jurisdictional issues surrounding the proposed PRGT pipeline project. The Federal Court of Appeal (2017 FCA 159) gave direction to the National Energy Board (NEB) to re-determine the federal or provincial jurisdiction in regard to the PRGT being subject to regulation under the NEB Act. The NEB is obligated to apply the legal principles governing paragraph 92(10)(a) of the <i>Constitution Act</i> correctly. The Court found NEB did not consider the following evidence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> PRGT Ltd. is a wholly owned subsidiary of TransCanada. TransCanada’s annual report encompasses the activities of PRGT. TransCanada’s annual financial statements consolidate “its interest in entities over which it is able to exercise control”. All of the directors of PRGT Ltd. hold senior management positions within TransCanada and one of the directors of PRGT sits on the Board of TransCanada. All of senior officers of PRGT held senior management positions at TransCanada and/or NGTL. Senior PRGT executives, including vice-president and controller of tax finance, and risk management hold positions in both PRGT and NGTL. TransCanada held itself out publically as the proponent of the project. Statements include “TransCanada will build, own and operate the Project” 	<p>Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Ltd. (PRGT) is requesting an extension of the Environmental Assessment Certificate (EAC) and is not requesting any changes to the Certified Project Description at this time. If commercial agreements result in changes to the Certified Project Description, PRGT would consult with affected Aboriginal groups, stakeholders and regulatory agencies through the working group process prior to applying for an amendment to the EAC.</p> <p>TransCanada is not aware of any current legal proceedings concerning the regulatory jurisdiction for PRGT that would affect PRGT’s application for an extension of the existing EAC for the Project.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.</p>	

			<p>h. TransCanada's PRGT project overview makes no reference to its wholly owned subsidiary, treating it as one and the same.</p> <p>i. TransCanada's corporate logo, copyright, legal notice and e-mail addresses are displayed on the PRGT Project webpage.</p> <p>j. The domain name for the PRGT Project is registered to TransCanada.</p> <p>k. The emergency and procurement contact numbers for the PRGT Project are for TransCanada employees.</p> <p>l. All aspects of the PRGT Project, including aboriginal, environmental assessment, routing, design, and engineering are to be conducted by TransCanada employees or its consultants. The PRGT and Nova Gas Transmission Ltd (NGTL) will be monitored and controlled by TransCanada Operations Centre in Calgary.</p>			
30	Luutkudziiwus	Project Viability	<p>The viability and status of the PRGT as stated by TransCanada Pipelines Ltd (TCPL) in their North Montney Mainline (NMML) Variance application, wherein TCPL stated that the PRGT would not proceed and the gas would flow through the NGTL to other markets;</p>	<p>The decision by the National Energy Board (NEB) in MH-031-2017 requires NGTL to return to the NEB for approval of a tolling methodology for the North Montney Mainline Facilities should NGTL decide to apply to deliver gas to other markets not currently connected to NGTL. Currently, there are no other connections to markets other than those already attached to the NGTL System. Additionally, should NGTL propose any new connection to a market, or customers in general, it must make an application to the NEB for approval of the new facilities that would be required for that connection.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
31	Luutkudziiwus	Project Description	<p>PRGT states in the Certificate extension request that the project remains unchanged from the Schedule A Certified Project Description. However, PRGT no longer have a gas supply, and thus their start point may change; as well, they no longer have a known end-point facility. Those are considered two significant changes;</p>	<p>PRGT is requesting an extension of the EAC and is not requesting changes to the Certified Project Description at this time. If commercial agreements result in changes to the Certified Project Description, PRGT would consult with the EAO, Aboriginal groups and regulatory agencies prior to applying for an amendment to the EAC.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
32	Luutkudziiwus	Consultation	<p>PRGT states in their request for an extension to EAC #E14-06, no new information in regard to Aboriginal interests that would change the conclusions reached in the EA Certificate. However, Luutkudziiwus was granted standing with our Federal court judicial review of the Pacific NorthWest LNG Project proposed by Pacific NorthWest LNG Limited Partnership at the terminus of the Prince Rupert Gas Transmission pipeline, which was cancelled July 25, 2017 (Federal court file: T-271-17). Luutkudziiwus has yet to engage in any substantive discussions with PRGT. Luutkudziiwus asserts that the Crown and PRGT need to engage in serious discussions including real or potential impacts to our rights and title;</p>	<p>PRGT has engaged with all directly affected Gitksan Hereditary Chiefs since the project was announced in 2013. PRGT made considerable efforts to be inclusive in its engagement approach with the Gitksan Nation, including wilps, huwilp and community members, throughout the process and remains open to continued engagement to understand additional concerns with respect to the Project. Should the project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will continue engagement with the directly affected Gitksan Hereditary Chiefs. Any new site-specific information brought forward to PRGT will be captured in the Construction Environment Management Plan.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	

33	Luutkudziiwus	Archaeology/Culture	Currently, there have been no archaeological or cultural investigations completed on Luutkudziiwus' Madii Lii territory where the proposed PRGT pipe will cross for roughly 34.5 km. Without knowledge of ancient and more recent past cultural infrastructure and heritage, it is difficult to estimate the scope, extent, and significance of impacts that could occur and justify any infringement to our rights and title;	PRGT completed the required Archaeological Overview Assessment (AOA) for the entire project route in its Environmental Assessment Application. PRGT had also committed to completing Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIA) for the route and has subsequently received an Oil and Gas Commission (OGC) condition that requires completion of an AIA prior to construction. PRGT acknowledges that one remaining AIA requires completion prior to construction. PRGT has provided the directly affected Gitxsan Hereditary Chiefs with all complete Interim AIA reports within Gitxsan territory. Should the project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will engage with the directly affected Gitxsan Hereditary Chiefs in order to facilitate completion of the AIA.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
34	Luutkudziiwus	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	With the construction and operation of the LNG Canada project, it appears any future proposed LNG facility would be required to have significant reductions in GHG emissions in order to meet targets established by the <i>Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets Act</i> . However, if PRGT is approved as a LNG supply pipeline to an unknown LNG facility, there is no certainty that the unknown LNG facility would meet the significant reductions in emissions required.	PRGT would anticipate that any future LNG project will be assessed in accordance with applicable legal requirements at the time of the application, (including GHG emissions).	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response. The Project received the EAC on November 25, 2014. The Project and the Pacific NorthWest LNG (PNW LNG) facility were assessed separately as two distinct projects, and as such received two separate EACs. Any future proposed LNG facility would be required to undergo its own EA and would be required to comply with appropriate legislation at that time. The cancellation of PNW LNG and the possibility of a future proposed LNG facility to do not constitute a material change to the Project.	
35	Luutkudziiwus	UNDRIP	Luutkudziiwus expects the Province to fulfill its constitutional obligations to us prior to any decisions which could affect the exercise of our title and rights, including the provision of sufficient funding to enable our informed participation in engagement. We also expect the Province to seek our consent before authorizing development activities on our lands, consistent with the direction of the Supreme Court of Canada and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	N/A	The Project has already received an EAC under the current <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> , S.B.C. 2002, c.43 (current Act), and since it has not been constructed the extension is required under the current Act. The new <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> , S.B.C. 2018, c. 51 (the new Act) is anticipated to be brought into force later in 2019, after the development of necessary key regulations and policies. The Province is committed to adopting and implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). However, the Province has been clear that the new Act, which includes supporting the implementation of UNDRIP, applies only to new projects going forward and does not retroactively take away or require the reassessment of environmental assessment certificates already granted. While it is not possible to go back and incorporate UNDRIP into the EA, the EAO is incorporating the principles of UNDRIP into the review of this extension request by being open to collaboration with First Nations and attempting to reach consensus on conclusions. The EAO does not currently provide capacity funding to First Nations for extension request review processes, however, the EAO is committed to further discussions to fully understand your views and address any concerns you may have.	

					The EAO's guidance on Requesting an EA Certificate Extension states, "When considering a request, the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) considers such things as the rationale for requiring an extension, the certificate holder's compliance record, and new or changed potential significant adverse effects." EA Certificate extension applications are not an opportunity to revisit issues that were already raised and addressed. The Ministers' Reasons for Decision on the Project EA states that they "are satisfied that the Province has fulfilled its obligations for consultation and accommodation to Aboriginal Groups".	
36	Saulteau	Project Cancellations in Prince Rupert	<p>The sole purpose of PRGT was to transmit gas to the proposed PNW LNG project on Lelu Island. The Lelu Island site proved to be infeasible and the proponent announced that the PNW LNG project would not proceed (July 25, 2017). The proponent also formally terminated its project development agreement with the Prince Rupert Port Authority (July 28, 2017). The proponent has since shifted its interest to Kitimat by acquiring a twenty-five percent interest in the LNG Canada. In the meantime, all of the other companies with proposed LNG projects near Prince Rupert have cancelled those proposed projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shell cancelled the development of its proposed Prince Rupert LNG export facility (March 10, 2017); • CNOOC cancelled the development of its proposed Aurora LNG export facility (September 14, 2017); • Woodside cancelled the development of its proposed Grassy Point LNG export facility (March 14, 2018); • Exxon Mobile withdrew its environmental assessment application for its proposed WCC LNG export facility (December 20, 2018); <p>There are currently zero proposed LNG projects that could be serviced by PRGT. Further, the Applicant has not provided any evidence to support its claim that the LNG market for gas sourced from British Columbia is strengthening; in fact all of the evidence is that there are no prospects for a LNG facility in Prince Rupert in the foreseeable future. The working group and the Minister must require that the Applicant provide credible evidence to support all of the claims it makes in its reasons for seeking an extension.</p>	<p>As described in the EAC extension application, PRGT is seeking an extension of its EAC, as permitted by the BC Environmental Assessment Act, while it continues to explore potential opportunities that would require transportation of natural gas to the Prince Rupert area.</p> <p>PRGT understands changes to supply or markets does not require changes to the EAC under the EAA.</p> <p>PRGT noted in its EAC extension application that the outlook for global LNG demand has strengthened since July of 2017 when the proposed Pacific NorthWest LNG facility cancelled their project. Forecasted increases in LNG demand continuing into the next decade are noted by multiple publicly available forecasts (ex. BP Energy Outlook 2019, Shell LNG Outlook 2019, McKinsey & Company Global Gas & LNG Outlook to 2035).</p> <p>In addition, there can be no stronger indicator of the demand for Canadian LNG than the announcement by LNG Canada of a positive FID on October 1, 2018, following its announcement in July 2016 of a delay in FID due to global industry challenges.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response. The Prince Rupert Gas Transmission project (Project) received Environmental Assessment Certificate #E14-06 (EAC) on November 25, 2014. PRGT and the Pacific NorthWest LNG (PNW LNG) facility were assessed separately as two distinct projects, and as such received two separate EACs. Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Ltd. (PRGT) is requesting an extension of the EAC and is not requesting changes to the Project Description at this time; the size, capacity, and length of the proposed pipeline and terminus location will all remain the same. If commercial agreements result in changes in to the Project Description, PRGT would need to apply for an amendment to the EAC.</p>	

37	Saulteau	Imminent Threat to Caribou	<p>On May 4, 2018, the federal Minister of Environment and Climate Change, acting pursuant to the Species at Risk Act, determined that there is an 'imminent threat' to the recovery of Southern Mountain Caribou in British Columbia. In its application, the Applicant appears to try to downplay the significance of the Minister's determination by claiming that the Pine LPU is not a matter of particular concern. This is simply not a true characterization of the federal Minister's imminent threat decision. In fact, Minister McKenna has expressly confirmed that her determination that southern mountain caribou is facing imminent threats to its recovery applies to the entire species.</p> <p>Conditions 17 and 18 and the related plans are now insufficient and require further review and revision.</p>	<p>PRGT provided a fulsome description and assessment of potential impacts to caribou in the Application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate. In the EAO's Assessment Report, it was determined that the residual effects to caribou from the proposed Project would likely interact with reasonably foreseeable future projects to create additional cumulative effects. EAO deemed that it is likely that cumulative effects on mortality risk are already significant and included Conditions 17 and 18 in PRGT's EAC to address the state of caribou.</p> <p>Guidance for preparing the PRGT Extension application includes a requirement to identify 'new information'. The Imminent Threat Assessment was considered new information that had not been included in the Application; however is not inconsistent with the EAO's finding on the state of caribou as it relates to the Project. The Application for an extension of the EAC, referred to specific wording utilized in the Imminent Threat Assessment with respect to "particular concern".</p> <p>The Imminent Threat Assessment recognizes the state of caribou, but does not change the type of mitigation (e.g., habitat restoration) detailed in Condition 17 that is required to address the state of caribou. The contribution to the provincial caribou program required under Condition 18 would also not likely be changed by the Imminent Threat Assessment.</p> <p>PRGT's intent was not to downplay the importance of threats to caribou, but rather to demonstrate that the Imminent Threat Assessment would not result in a change to the assessed Project. It is unlikely that the conclusions of the Assessment would change as a result of the Imminent Threat Assessment.</p> <p>PRGT acknowledges the significant efforts being undertaken federally and provincially with respect to caribou. PRGT has developed, in consultation with FLNRORD, Aboriginal groups and Environment and Climate Change Canada, a Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan that meets the requirements of Condition 17 of its EAC.</p> <p>With respect to Caribou, PRGT welcomes Saulteau's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with Saulteau on the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan and Access Management Plan.</p> <p>PRGT has become aware of the Draft Partnership Agreement between British Columbia, Canada, West Moberly First Nations and Saulteau First Nations to Recover the Central Group of Southern Mountain Caribou. PRGT looks forward to further engagement on that Draft Plan.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
38	Saulteau	Climate Change and	In 2018, the Province of BC enacted new greenhouse gas emission targets, using 2007	PRGT received an Amendment to the EAC to add a standby compressor unit to each of the proposed compressor stations.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response. The Project received an EAC on November 25, 2014. PRGT and the	

		GHG Emissions	<p>emissions as the baseline level and requiring a reduction of 40% by 2030, 60% by 2040, and 80% by 2050.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the Applicant has been planning on increasing (not decreasing) the number of 33MW gas-fired turbo compressor units available to the project.</p> <p>The working group and the Minister must consider the potential impacts of PRGT (and any future LNG export facility it may service) on greenhouse gas emissions relative to the new provincial GHG reduction targets. Condition 4 and the related plans are now insufficient and require further review and revision.</p>	<p>As described in the amendment application, there are no changes to project emissions as a result of the addition of standby compressor units as the total number of running units remains the same. The standby compressor unit would run only when one of the other compressor units was not in operation.</p> <p>PRGT conducted a quantitative GHG assessment in accordance with the Application Information Requirements. The estimated emissions have not changed from that described in the application. PRGT developed a GHG Management Plan outlining mitigations to manage and reduce GHG's.</p> <p>PRGT would anticipate that any future LNG projects will be assessed in accordance with applicable legal requirements at the time of the application (including GHG emissions). PRGT acknowledges that BC has updated its emissions targets.</p>	<p>PNW LNG facility were assessed separately as two distinct projects, and as such received two separate EACs. Any future proposed LNG facility would be required to undergo its own EA and would be required to comply with appropriate legislation at that time. The cancellation of PNW LNG and the possibility of a future proposed LNG facility to do not constitute a material change to PRGT.</p>	
39	Saulteau	Provincial Commitments to First Nations	<p>Since the Certificate was issued, the provincial government has made a number of commitments to shared decision-making, reconciliation, and the full implementation of UNDRIP. Those commitments are set out in the recent Throne Speech, Ministers mandate letters, and other policy statements.</p> <p>We remain concerned about and opposed to the proposed route of PRGT. The project as currently designed will have significant adverse effects on our Treaty rights, and on our cultural and sacred sites.</p> <p>Conditions such as 14, 17-18, 23, 30, 34, 36 and 38-42 are insufficient and require further review.</p>	N/A	<p>The Province is committed to adopting and implementing the <i>United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</i> (UNDRIP). As you note, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy received a mandate letter from Premier Horgan on July 18, 2017 that notes that the Province will fully adopt and implement UNDRIP and the Calls to Action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Bill 51 was given royal assent on November 27, 2019. The new <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>, S.B.C. 2018, c. 51 (the new Act) is anticipated to be brought into force later in 2019, after the development of necessary key regulations and policies. The Province has been clear that the new Act applies only to new projects going forward and does not "reach back" to previous project decisions. In addition, Projects currently under assessment under the current EA Act will continue under the existing process, with practical transition provisions.</p> <p>The Project has already received an EAC under the current <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>, S.B.C. 2002, c.43 (current Act), and since it has not been constructed the extension is required under the current Act. The new Act is not yet in force but when it is, environmental assessment certificates received under the current Act will remain valid. The new Act does not retroactively take away or require the reassessment of environmental assessment certificates already granted. However, provisions of the new Act that apply to existing certificate holders, such as compliance and enforcement or rights to terminate certificates, will also apply to a project with an existing environmental assessment certificate.</p> <p>While it is not possible to go back and incorporate UNDRIP into the EA, the EAO is incorporating the principles of UNDRIP into the review of this extension request by being</p>	

					<p>open to collaboration with First Nations and attempting to reach consensus on conclusions.</p> <p>The Assessment Report for the Project notes that Saulteau First Nations raised concerns with the location of the proposed pipeline. The Ministers' Reasons for Decision also note that the Project underwent a number of route changes to address concerns from Aboriginal Groups, including Saulteau First Nations, and that Ministers' considered separate submissions from Saulteau First Nations in their decision. The EAO is of the view that while these concerns remain, they are not a change in circumstance since the original environmental assessment. The EAO is available to discuss these responses with Saulteau First Nations and any outstanding concerns.</p>	
40	Environment and Climate Change Canada	Species at Risk	<p>While ECCC understands that there have not been any material and/or specific changes to the project as described in Schedule A (Certified Project Description) of the Certificate, ECCC has conducted a cursory re-analysis of species ranges, critical habitat, and species status, and has determined that there may be changes to listed species for which there is the potential for interaction. Changes for these could impact the conclusions reached in the certificate, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is in the range of Little Brown Myotis, and potentially Northern Myotis (<i>Species at Risk Act (SARA) Schedule 1 Listing: Endangered; 2014 Nov</i>). In the original process and Assessment Report (AR), bats were not assessed as a valued component and thus no effects assessment was provided. Since the certificate was issued, ECCC has identified critical habitat for these species in eastern portion of the project area (50kmx50km grids in Figure 12B of https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/species-risk-public-registry/recovery-strategies/little-brown-myotis-2018.html). Based on a cursory analysis of the Proponent's AR and the BC-EAO's AR, ECCC is of the view that these changes could affect the conclusion on impacts. ECCC notes that the Province is the lead management jurisdiction for these species. The project is potentially in the range of Black Swift (COSEWIC Assessment: Endangered; 2015 May). Black Swift, a migratory bird, was not considered in the original application. It is not clear what the likelihood is of nesting 	<p>Little Brown Myotis</p> <p>PRGT recognizes that the status of little brown myotis and northern myotis has changed since filing the original application. As stated in the federal recovery strategy, the primary threat to little brown myotis and northern myotis is the spread of the invasive fungus <i>Pseudogymnoascus destructans</i> which causes white-nose syndrome. PRGT has reviewed mapped critical habitat in the federal recovery strategy and confirms that the Project does not overlap 'grid squares that contain critical habitat' for little brown myotis and northern myotis in British Columbia.</p> <p>In response to IR #1892 during review of the original application, PRGT reiterates the following: "As construction planning and detailed engineering design advance, identification of bat roost and hibernacula sites will be completed through a combined process of third-party data queries (e.g., provincial Wildlife Species Inventory and Conservation Data Centre) and Project-specific pre-clearing surveys (as part of surveys for other wildlife habitat features). Methods for identifying roosts and hibernacula will include searching potentially suitable habitat that overlaps with the Project footprint. A bat roost or hibernacula identified incidentally will be tracked and mitigated through PRGT's Wildlife Species of Concern Discovery Contingency Plan (see Section 36.4.2). As required, PRGT will consult with the appropriate regulatory authorities for additional guidance. "</p> <p>Black Swift</p> <p>PRGT included black swift as part of its field surveys for migratory birds by following provincial methods for 'swifts and swallows'. Among 498 breeding bird point count locations surveyed, black swift was not detected. PRGT's Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management Plan includes mitigation for migratory birds, and PRGT will review these mitigations for</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.</p>	<p>Contrary to the Proponent's analysis, ECCC found that the Project's potential changes in its footprint, as provided by PRGT in January 2019, overlaps with 50 x 50 km grid squares buffered around bat critical habitat (CH). These grid squares are available from the BC Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development and would confirm overlap between the Project and the 50km x 50km grids. It is unclear why the Proponent's information is inconsistent with this. This mapping, alongside other data and surveys, should be used to guide mitigation and adaptive management in the Wildlife Species of Concern Discovery Contingency Plan (Section 36.4.2).</p>

		<p>habitat being within the project area; however, ECCC notes that the project has the potential to impact stream and cliff habitats, which are key habitat features for foraging and nesting. With respect to Black Swift, there is limited information in relation to this Project from which ECCC can make further comments on the potential for adverse effects. ECCC is the lead management jurisdiction for this species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is in the range of Western Screech-Owl (<i>kennicottii</i> subspecies; SARA Schedule 1 Listing: Threatened, 2017 Feb) and Olive-sided Flycatcher (SARA Schedule 1 Listing: Threatened, 2010 Mar). In the original AR, Western Screech-Owl and Olive-sided Flycatcher (a migratory bird) were assessed part of the “terrestrial birds” VC, rather than as individual VCs. The AR concluded low magnitude of potential residual adverse effects with a medium to long term duration. The understanding of habitat requirements for Screech-Owl is evolving and recovery planning, including a recovery strategy and critical habitat mapping, is currently underway. A recovery strategy was finalized in 2016 for Olive-sided Flycatcher. Based upon a cursory analysis of the Proponent’s AR and the BC-EAO’s AR, ECCC is of the view that these changes could affect the conclusion on impacts, but not likely to the extent of being determined to be high in magnitude. ECCC notes that the Province is the lead management jurisdiction for Screech-Owl, and ECCC is the lead management jurisdiction on Olive-sided Flycatcher. The project is in the range of Grizzly Bear (SARA Schedule 1 Listing: Special Concern; 2018 May). The original AR assessed potential impacts to Grizzly Bear and habitat, including cumulative impacts. Given current levels of industrial activity along the proposed route(s), this listing could affect the conclusions reached in the certificate and result in some adverse effects, pending recommendations for management and recovery actions. A management plan is currently being developed for this species, which will <u>not</u> include identification of critical habitat (which is not required for special concern species). The management plan could be useful for 	<p>adequacy if black swift is discovered during clearing and construction. PRGT will also consult with ECCC as needed.</p> <p>Western Screech-Owl</p> <p>In the original application, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat was the Valued Component (VC) and 26 indicators were assessed in detail for the VC. Among the 26 indicators was western screech-owl and olive-sided flycatcher, each of which were assessed for change in habitat, change in mortality risk, and change in movement. Mitigation measures were proposed to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects, and during clearing and construction the Bird Nest Mitigation and Management Plan, and the Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Management Plan, will be applicable to western screech-owl and olive-sided flycatcher. PRGT will remain apprised of changes or updates to the status of western screech-owl and olive-sided flycatcher, including changes or updates to recovery planning documents. PRGT will consult with ECCC as needed.</p> <p>Grizzly Bear</p> <p>PRGT identified potential adverse project and cumulative effects for grizzly bear in the original application, and subsequently developed, as a requirement of EAC Condition 15, a comprehensive Grizzly Bear Mitigation and Management Plan to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects. In addition, PRGT’s Access Management Plan, Human Wildlife Conflict Plan, and Construction Environmental Management Plan each include best practices for avoiding or reducing sensory disturbance and human access onto and along the project right-of-way during construction and operation. PRGT will remain apprised of the issuance of new recovery planning documents and subsequent updates or changes, and as needed will consult with either ECCC or the Province.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>informing effects and mitigation for the project. ECCC notes that the effects to this species in the 2014 AR report were considered to be of medium magnitude and that there were several key conditions identified as part of the Environmental Assessment Certificate for this species. These included a requirement for mitigation to address sensory disturbance to Grizzly Bears and the risks of creating new access, including monitoring and adaptive management; and participation in or support of regional programs. ECCC also notes that the Province is the lead management jurisdiction for this species.</p>			
41	Environment and Climate Change Canada	Species at Risk: Southern Mountain Caribou	<p>After considering measures to mitigate effects, in the 2014 Environmental Assessment Office Assessment Report it was concluded that, “<u>residual</u> Project effects to caribou and cumulative effects to caribou are significant”. This assessment was based upon available information at that time, including critical habitat as identified in the 2014 Recovery Strategy for the Woodland Caribou, Southern Mountain population (<i>Rangifer tarandus caribou</i>) in Canada.</p> <p>Since that time, ECCC has been reviewing critical habitat mapping for Southern Mountain caribou, including all of the subpopulations / Local Population Units (LPUs) that this Project has the potential to impact (Takla LPU; Pine River LPU: Moberly, Kennedy Siding, Scott), in consultation with the Province and Indigenous groups. ECCC anticipates posting proposed revisions to the mapping in 2019-20, alongside revisions to the recovery strategy. ECCC has also undertaken disturbance mapping for categories of critical habitat to which the minimum 65% undisturbed habitat metric applies (i.e. non-high elevation critical habitat within the LPU boundaries for the Central and Northern Groups). Based on ECCC’s information, including draft revisions to critical habitat mapping, the proposed project is expected to result in destruction of a larger amount of critical habitat than what was understood in the 2014 EAO Assessment Report. In addition, ECCC can now confirm that there is less than 65% undisturbed habitat in all of the categories of critical habitat to which that disturbance metric applies, within each of the LPUs potentially affected by the Project.</p>	<p>PRGT identified potential adverse project and cumulative effects for Southern Mountain Caribou in the original application and subsequently developed, as a requirement of EAC Condition 17, a comprehensive Caribou Mitigation and Management Plan to avoid or reduce potential adverse effects. In addition, PRGT’s Access Management Plan and Construction Environmental Management Plan include best practices for avoiding or reducing sensory disturbance and human and predator access onto and along the project right-of-way during construction and operation. PRGT will remain apprised of changes or updates to the status of Southern Mountain Caribou, including changes or updates to recovery planning documents and critical habitat delineations. As needed, PRGT consult with either ECCC or the Province.</p>	<p>The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.</p>	<p>ECCC recognizes that PRGT has developed a comprehensive Caribou Mitigation and Management Plan (CMMP) and that PRGT will remain apprised of changes or updates to the status of SMC. From ECCC’s perspective it is also important that the CMMP be updated to reflect the most recent information on caribou habitat needs and disturbance, the Imminent Threat Assessment, and the federal-provincial and Federal-First Nations Partnership Agreements for SMC conservation. ECCC remains of the view that the potential magnitude of effects would now be greater than what was understood at that time and would contribute to greater cumulative effects than those that existed in 2014 when the certificate was issued.</p>

			<p>In May 2018, the federal Minister of Environment and Climate Change determined that there was an imminent threat to the recovery of Southern Mountain Caribou. The most significant and immediate threat to recovery was identified as unsustainable predation resulting from habitat changes, which have led to changes to predator and prey communities and direct disturbance and displacement of individual caribou.</p> <p>Based on this re-evaluation, it is ECCC's view that the EAO's 2014 conclusion with respect to caribou is not expected to be impacted by this new information. However, the potential magnitude of those effects would now be greater than what was understood at that time and would contribute to greater cumulative effects than those that existed in 2014 when the certificate was issued. Furthermore, as supported by the 2014 conclusion, the mitigation measures and conditions of the certificate were unlikely to fully address the adverse effects of the project to caribou. Given the new information, the discrepancy between the adverse effects of this project and the proposed mitigation measures is likely greater. ECCC notes that the Province is the lead management jurisdiction for this species.</p>			
42	Doig River First Nation	<p>EAC extension application document (EAC extension application Rev1_final.pdf)</p> <p>Section 14.6 Cumulative effects Pg 14-169</p>	<p>"The assessment indicated that the most significant and immediate threat to recovery is unsustainable predation resulting from habitat changes, which have led to changes to predator and prey communities and direct disturbance and displacement of individual caribou."</p> <p>"In this context, the Project's effect on change in mortality risk through improved access is only one of several factors leading to declines in regional caribou populations. PRGT recognizes that industrial development is a key concern for caribou in the Southern Mountain population and has identified specific measures to reduce the project-related effect"</p> <p>This is conspicuously dismissive of the underlying cause of habitat changes- namely disturbances including oil & gas (as acknowledged in Section 14.6).</p>	<p>The statement from the EAC Extension Application that is described in this comment as "conspicuously dismissive of the underlying cause of habitat changes" is based on content in the federal Imminent Threat Assessment, not PRGT's environmental assessment. There was no intent to understate the importance of caribou or threats to the species or habitat.</p> <p>PRGT recognizes industrial development as the primary cause of habitat change in northern British Columbia and has developed a suite of caribou-specific mitigation measures, including the Caribou Habitat Restoration Plan (CHRP), that address functional and ecological changes to habitat resulting from industrial development</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
43	Doig River First Nation	Assessment of Cumulative Effects	Table 3-3 lists the preliminary project inclusion for cumulative effects assessment.	PRGT maintains that the assessment of cumulative effects in the EAC Application is valid. PRGT conducted its assessment in accordance with EAO guidance and the Application Information	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	

		<p>Application Information Requirements Part 1 pg 21 (PRGT AIR Part 1.pdf)</p> <p>14.6 Cumulative effects Table 14-55</p>	<p>“Detailed quantitative information on reasonably foreseeable future project and activity footprints is not available”</p> <p>Many of these future project and activity footprints are available now. It is appropriate to map them for Working Group members and conduct a cumulative effects assessment that includes them.</p>	<p>Requirements and included reasonably foreseeable projects and activities that had been publicly announced at the time.</p> <p>Projects assessed and approved after the issuance of PRGT’s EAC were required to include the PRGT Project when addressing their potential cumulative effects where there was overlap with the PRGT Project.</p> <p>PRGT acknowledges that some new projects have advanced, while several major projects that were considered as part of the PRGT’s cumulative effects assessment have since been cancelled or have not yet been constructed.</p> <p>It is PRGT’s view that the conclusions of the EAO’s Assessment Report and the ministerial decision remain valid today. Mitigations provided in the Application and management plans required to satisfy EAC conditions will reduce Project-related effects and remain relevant to minimize the Project’s contribution to cumulative effects.</p>		
44	Doig River First Nation	<p>Section 14 Wildlife and Habitat (14 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat Part 1.pdf)</p> <p>Table 14-14 – Mitigation measures</p>	<p>Table 14-14 provides a very long list of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Are all of the mitigation measures listed in this table included in the caribou mitigation and monitoring plan? This list should be referred to as part of ongoing consultation with DRFN on this project to guide future discussions about caribou mitigation measures.</p>	<p>PRGT confirms that all the mitigation in Section 14 of the Application for an Environmental Assessment Certificate for the PRGT Project are included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and/or the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CMMP). All of the mitigations in both of these documents apply to activities within caribou ranges.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
45	Doig River First Nation	<p>Section 14.6 Cumulative effects</p> <p>Table 14-55 Pg 14-138</p>	<p>“There is no reasonable expectation that the Project’s contribution in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects would result in cumulative effects on habitat availability that would adversely affect the sustainability of these indicators.”</p> <p>There is no reasonable expectation that the project’s contribution in combination with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable project would <i>not</i> result in cumulative effects on habitat availability. This is evident in this same table under the column for “cumulative fashion with the effects of past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects and activities”.</p> <p>With regard to cumulative impacts to caribou, the reason the proponent doesn’t expect</p>	<p>With respect to cumulative effects, the BC Environmental Assessment Office Assessment Report assessed cumulative effects on caribou as significant. The report states “The residual effects to caribou from the proposed Project would likely interact with reasonably foreseeable future projects to create additional cumulative effects. As stated above, it is likely that cumulative effects on mortality risk are already significant. For the CGL and WCGT Projects, EAO has proposed similar conditions regarding potential effects to caribou, including providing financial contributions. Taking into account the effects from existing projects and activities to caribou, the status of caribou and the sensitivity of caribou to disturbance, cumulative effects to caribou are considered to be significant”.</p> <p>As a condition of approval, PRGT is required to develop a CMMP (Condition 17 to the EA Certificate) and enter into a Caribou Agreement with FLNRORD that will set out the terms of the PRGT’s participation in a program of activities (Caribou Program) that supports the conservation and management of those caribou populations potentially affected by the Project</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	

			cumulative effects could either be because not all projects were taken into account (due to omissions or due to activity footprints not being available) or because they expect the caribou mitigation and monitoring plan to sufficiently mitigate them	(Condition 18 to the EA Certificate). This agreement also requires that PRGT contribute up to \$2 million toward the costs for implementation of the Program. PRGT has developed and submitted the CMMP, which was approved by the BC EAO in November 2015. Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will take all actions necessary to proceed to construction, including, entering into a Caribou Agreement with FLNRORD.		
46	Doig River First Nation	Section 14.6 Cumulative effects Table 14-54, 14-55, 14-59, 14-61, 14-64 Pg 14-138, 14-151, 14-180	<p>Concern for cumulative effects:</p> <p>Changes in habitat: yes, but not significant (no winter range directly affected, and caribou mitigation and monitoring plan will mitigate all impacts adequately)</p> <p>Changes in mortality: yes and carried forward to detailed cumulative effects assessment (Cumulative effects on mortality risk have been identified as a key concern for these indicators in British Columbia.)</p> <p>Changes in movement: no (“Large mammals are unlikely to perceive the pipeline footprint as a barrier to movement.”)</p> <p>Table 14-64 states that “large mammals are unlikely to perceive the pipeline a barrier to movement” misses the point. The concern is that it <i>facilitates</i> movement. This is a <i>high</i> likelihood and <i>long-term</i> residual effect and this is likely the most significant effect to caribou.</p> <p>Table 14-64 states that “Grizzly bear may use the pipeline footprint as a travel route” but doesn’t acknowledge that ungulates will as well. There is a relationship between mortality and movement, whereas this assessment only acknowledges changes to access on pg. 14-169, but not to movement, for caribou. This is fundamental concern- caribou mortality, access and movement are closely related and will all be affected by this project- and a major omission from the consideration of impacts to caribou by this project. If the former, the cumulative effects assessment should be updated, if the latter, DRFN should have an active role in the updating and implementation of the caribou monitoring and mitigation plan.</p>	<p>Linear corridors can facilitate movement for some species (e.g., wolves), but may be perceived as a barrier by other species (e.g., small mammals); discussions on these potential effects are included in the assessment for change in movement.</p> <p>The linkage between movement patterns of predators and caribou, and how caribou mortality risk is increased as a result of predator movement along linear features, is assessed under ‘change in mortality risk’ in Section 14 of the EA, including a detailed cumulative effects assessment in Section 14.6. PRGT developed a suite of caribou-specific mitigation measures, including the CRRP, that address functional and ecological changes to habitat and movement patterns resulting from linear feature development.</p> <p>Per Table 2 of the EAC extension application (‘Summary of Consultation on Certificate Extension’) and our meeting on March 12, 2019, PRGT is aware of Doig River First Nation’s interest in working with PRGT proactively on caribou issues and caribou management plans and has committed to re-engaging with Doig River First Nation on this issue, should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
47	Doig River First Nation	Table 14-54	“Does the Project residual effect on the indicator act, or likely to act, in a cumulative fashion with the effects of past, present or	The first question asks whether the Project residual effects are likely to act cumulatively with the residual effects of other past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects or activities, and the second question seeks to understand the potential magnitude	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	

			<p>reasonably foreseeable projects and activities?”</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>“Is there a reasonable expectation that the contribution (i.e. addition) of the Project’s residual effects to the residual effects from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would result in adverse cumulative effects of concern to the indicator?”</p> <p>Please explain the difference between these two statements and how could it could be “yes” for the first and “no” for the second. Is it because the Caribou mitigation and monitoring plan will ensure that it is a “no” for the second? This is contradictory and also implies that although the project will contribute to cumulative effects, the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan will fully mitigate them. A lot is hanging on that Plan. If we have interpreted this correctly, DRFN and the proponent must have continued meaningful dialogue on the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan and an active role in designing and implementing caribou mitigation measures.</p> <p>This document acknowledges that there are adverse project residual effects on woodland caribou, and this will act, or likely to act, in a cumulative fashion with the effects of past, present or reasonably foreseeable projects and activities, yet also claims that there is no reasonable expectation that the project would result in adverse cumulative effects. The proponent claims this is true for caribou, moose and bears. This is difficult to believe. The Caribou Habitat Restoration Plan is referred to should compensate for the acknowledged cumulative effects.</p>	<p>of the Project’s cumulative contribution. If the answer is ‘yes’ to both questions, a detailed cumulative effects assessment is completed, and additional mitigations are considered for reducing the Project’s contribution to cumulative residual effects. If the first answer is ‘yes’ and the second is ‘no’, then the conclusion is that the Project’s contribution to cumulative residual effects is small and reasonably mitigated through best practices. For caribou, PRGT concluded ‘yes’ for the first question, and ‘no’ for the second question because the Project’s contribution to cumulative residual effects was considered very small, and because PRGT had committed to developing and implementing an Access Management Plan and a CMMP to avoid or reduce Project residual effects.</p> <p>In the BC EAO assessment report for the Project, cumulative residual effects on caribou were assessed as significant. Considering this conclusion, the Project’s EAC includes a condition for a CMMP. The CMMP includes PRGT’s commitment to continue Aboriginal engagement on the implementation of the CMMP, and Section 5.2.2. of the CMMP includes the need to consider offsets with a goal of ‘no net loss’, which by definition addresses the Project’s contribution to cumulative effects. The need for offsets will be based on the measured effectiveness of mitigation measures described in the CMMP and the Access Management Plan.</p>		
48	Doig River First Nation	<p>Table 14-54m pg 14-141</p> <p>14-61, pg 14-169</p>	<p>Cumulative effects assessment for change in habitat</p> <p>Cumulative effects on linear density in caribou herd ranges</p> <p>“PRGT’s Project footprint intersects the Moberly/Klinse-Za, Kennedy Siding, Scott</p>	<p>The statement in the EAC extension application related to the Moberly/Klinse-za, Kennedy Siding, Scott, and Takla herds is not intended to be dismissive of concerns related to the conservation of Southern Mountain Caribou. That statement reflects content in the federal Imminent Threat Assessment, specifically the statement on page 2 that “notes a particular concern” for ten local population units; a group that does not include Moberly/Klinse-za, Kennedy Siding, Scott, or Takla.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	

		<p>EAC extension application document (EAC extension application Rev1_final.pdf)</p>	<p>and Takla caribou herd ranges which were not reported as one of the local populations of particular concern under the Imminent Threat Assessment.”</p> <p>This section lists density of linear disturbance (km/km²) as the only relevant indicator, and a threshold of 1.2 km/km². Are there other indicators for disturbance to caribou, including avoidance area (a 250m buffer around disturbances).</p> <p>The percent change in habitat as it is presented here is an irrelevant statistic because the denominator (a caribou range) is and will always be far, far larger than a linear disturbance footprint, making any new disturbance footprint seem insignificant (and has been observed being abused in countless environmental impact assessments). A single, extremely long (hundreds of km) linear disturbance footprint is in itself significant in disrupting predator-prey dynamics in the vicinity of the herd. It only takes one PRGT to create a viable movement corridor that wildlife will use to expend less energy while hunting / foraging. This is a major shortcoming that must be addressed if an extension is granted, as the continued decline of caribou herds affected by this project is now even more clear than it was in 2014. Even back in 2014, the Moberly and Kennedy herds were declining and forecasted to continue to decline in the long-term. It is again dismissive and inappropriate to suggest that these herds, and the Scott and Takla herds, are not of concern.</p>	<p>In the BC EAO assessment report for the Project, cumulative effects on caribou were assessed as significant; as a condition of approval, PRGT is required to develop a CMMP (Condition 17 to the EA Certificate) and enter into a Caribou Agreement with FLNR that will set out the terms of the PRGT’s participation in a program of activities (Caribou Program) that supports the conservation and management of those caribou populations potentially affected by the Project (Condition 18 to the EA Certificate). This agreement also requires that PRGT contribute up to \$2 million toward the costs for implementation of the Program. PRGT has developed and submitted the CMMP, which was approved by the BC EAO in November 2015. Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will take all actions necessary to proceed to construction, including, entering into a Caribou Agreement with FLNR.</p> <p>Additionally, as stated on page 4 of the EAC extension application, PRGT will continue to monitor developments related to caribou recovery processes, programs, and plans. Should any new information arise out of these initiatives, or other federal or provincial assessments or Orders, PRGT would incorporate such information, as required, in future amendments, future permitting, and/or relevant updates to the CMMP and/or the Access Management Plan.</p>		
49	Doig River First Nation	Table 14-62	<p>This table claims no significance with medium confidence.</p> <p>There isn’t a single summary table that expects any significant cumulative effect to grizzly bear, caribou or moose, whether for habitat, mortality or movement.</p> <p>These are questionable conclusions and again points to the need for an extremely high-standard in the caribou monitoring and mitigation plan. The caribou habitat mitigation and monitoring plan should continue to be developed in collaboration</p>	<p>PRGT acknowledges the importance of the effectiveness of the implementation of the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan and will continue to monitor developments related to caribou recovery processes, programs, and plans. Should any new information arise out of these initiatives, or other federal or provincial assessments or Orders, PRGT would incorporate such information, as required, in relevant updates to the CMMP.</p> <p>PRGT is committed to working proactively on caribou issues and implementation of the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan with Aboriginal groups including Doig River First Nation.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	

			with DRFN and updated as needed throughout the project planning process.			
50	Doig River First Nation	Section 15 - Summary of Assessment of Potential Environmental Effects Table 15-1, pg 15-26 Section 14 Wildlife and Habitat Table 14-54	<p>Table 15-1 states that “no defined high elevation winter range or designated UWR is affected by the Project; up to 1 ha of designated Wildlife Habitat Area for caribou could be affected (i.e., worst-case). A Caribou Habitat Restoration Plan will be developed for the Project. Mitigation measures that address the effect mechanisms will benefit moose and grizzly bear where they overlap caribou herd ranges.”</p> <p>Table 14-54 lists residual effects occurring in the ungulate winter range and caribou herd range.</p> <p>These are conflicting statements. If there are impacts to ungulate winter ranges, it doesn’t instill confidence that indeed there are no significant impacts to caribou as summarized in table 14-62.</p> <p>The caribou mitigation and monitoring plan should address the impacts to ungulate winter range stated in table 14-54.</p>	<p>Residual effects for caribou were identified in Section 14 of the EA; however, these effects were predicted to be not significant (i.e., not predicted to adversely affect the long-term sustainability of caribou after mitigation measures are implemented).</p> <p>In the BC EAO assessment report for the Project, effects on caribou were assessed as significant. Considering this conclusion, the Project’s EAC includes a condition for a CMMP, and enter into a Caribou Agreement with FLNR that will set out the terms of the PRGT’s participation in a program of activities (Caribou Program) that supports the conservation and management of those caribou populations potentially affected by the Project (Condition 18 to the EA Certificate). This agreement also requires that PRGT contribute up to \$2 million toward the costs for implementation of the Program. PRGT has since developed and submitted the CMMP, which was approved by the BC EAO in November 2015. The CMMP includes measures designed to reduce adverse effects on caribou, such as scheduling construction activities outside of sensitive time periods, to the extent possible. Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will take all actions necessary to proceed to construction, including, entering into a Caribou Agreement with FLNRORD.</p> <p>Table 14-54 of the Application does not indicate a project effect on caribou ungulate winter range; the table states that “No defined high elevation winter range or designated UWR is affected by the Project”.</p>	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
51	Doig River First Nation	CMMP Table 1-1 pg 2	<p>Understanding of cumulative linear disturbance</p> <p>Table 1-1 speaks to the amount of line through 4 caribou herd areas, and compares how much is parallel to existing linear features versus new.</p> <p>In general, where linear features can be co-located that should help reduce the overall disturbance footprint (including buffer). I’d like to understand where the new linear feature will be in relation to existing. How far away is the “parallel” feature existing?</p>	The distances of parallel features from the Project within caribou range varies Proximity is generally constrained by required buffers to existing infrastructure (e.g., roads, powerlines, pipelines, etc.) and topographic features.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
52	Doig River First Nation	CMMP section 1.2 page 2	<p>Duration of monitoring</p> <p>Is TC able to monitor longer than “5 years post construction”? Many of the remediations will have barely taken hold, and it will be important to monitor access over longer time frames.</p>	Condition 17 of PRGT’s Environmental Assessment Certificate requires that, should an analysis of monitoring data at the end of 5 years indicate that mitigations are ineffective (i.e., targets are not being met), then adjustments to mitigation will be necessary (Figure 8-4) and this could include addition years of monitoring as per section 8.4 of the CHRP (Appendix A of the CMMP).	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	

				PRGT welcomes Doig River First Nation's continued input and looks forward to further engagement and collaboration with DRFN on implementation of the plans.		
53	Doig River First Nation	CMMP Page 3	Serrouya paper Serrouya et al 2019 has been published since this was initially written. It's worth visiting.	PRGT is aware of papers such as Serrouya et al 2019, and will continue to review it, and other new information, as it becomes available.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
54	Doig River First Nation	CMMP 2.1.1 – pg 6 CHRP 2.2.3 pg 10/68 CHRP 4.2.3 pg 18/68 CHRP 7.1.3 pg 31/68	Access control – generally, physical barriers Wherever this comes up in the document, it should be recognized that there has never been an effective physical barrier to human access. Gates, ditches don't work. People are enterprising and many believe they have a right to access everywhere regardless of barriers. Suggest discussing with FLNRO the possibility of adding regulatory restrictions under the Wildlife Act or FRPA as well. At the same time, softer methods may also be useful – outreach/education at access points and engagement with local clubs (snowmobiles etc) to discuss voluntary restrictions	The monitoring component of the CMMP includes adaptive management procedures including consultation with FLNRORD should monitoring of access controls indicate they are being ineffective. PRGT and FLNRORD have discussed the potential for FLNRORD to put in place restrictions under the Wildlife Act. PRGT also recognizes that outreach/education at access points and engagement with local recreation clubs to discuss voluntary restrictions may be helpful in ensuring access control are kept in place (i.e., effective).	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
55	Doig River First Nation	CMMP 2.1.1 pg 6 CMMP 5.1.4 pg 17	Offsetting The "offsetting calculator" was developed after this document was created in 2016.	PRGT is aware that BC is working to finalize an offsetting calculator. Should offsets be required, PRGT will consult with FLNRORD regarding applicability of the calculator to the Project.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
56	Doig River First Nation	CMMP 2.1.2 pg 7	Critical habitat What happens is ECCC identifies that PRGT is within additional critical habitat?	Should ECCC identify that PRGT is within additional critical habitat, PRGT would apply the CMMP to those additional areas.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
57	Doig River First Nation	CMMP 2.2 pg 8	Monitoring Monitoring itself is insufficient. It's possible that the province can simply "monitor" the extinction of woodland caribou. PRGT can advocate for effective population measures such as predator removal. Activities should include DRFN members where appropriate. Population management is required in the short term.	N/A	The Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CMMP) is required in the Table of Conditions for the EAC. The condition requires adaptive management measures to respond to results of monitoring and assessment results. The condition also requires PRGT to provide reasonable opportunity to Aboriginal Groups with asserted traditional territories affected by the Project that overlap Caribou Ranges to review and provide input regarding the CMMP. Additionally, the Province is currently working with the Government of Canada, West Moberly and Sauteau First Nations on caribou recovery. The EAO's guidance on Requesting an EA Certificate Extension states, "When considering a request, the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) considers such things as the rationale for requiring an extension, the certificate holder's compliance record, and new or changed potential significant adverse effects." EA Certificate extension applications are not an opportunity to revisit issues that were already raised and addressed. The EAO is of the view that while these concerns remain, they	

					are not a change in circumstance since the original environmental assessment	
58	Doig River First Nation	CMMP 3.0 pg 10 CHRP 2.2.4 pg 10/68 CHRP 4.2.4 pg 19/68	Increased predation/LOS The idea of “line of sight” is important along linear corridors, however it’s important to recognize that the issue is less about prey visibility over distance than it is about energetics of movement and increased probability of prey encounter per unit of energy expended. Linear features can present lower energy expenditures for wolves searching for prey within a given area, and once human access has occurred that energy expenditure can be considerably lower. Mitigation should be focused on making it harder for both to move down the line.	While line of sight barriers are primarily implemented to break sight distances, they are constructed as barriers or in combination with barriers, such as berms or rollback, that also deter access along the right of way by predator and prey species.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
59	Doig River First Nation	CMMP 3.0 pg 10	Mitigation of residual adverse effects Can TC consider remediation of habitat off-tenure for previous disturbance?	Yes, Section 5.2.2 of the CMMP includes an option for reviewing opportunities for off-site habitat restoration (e.g., linear feature management) should monitoring show that the proposed mitigation is not achieving the objectives within five years.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
60	Doig River First Nation		“Caribou Program” Does “Caribou program” refer to any ongoing provincial caribou initiative? The document pre-dates the development of the \$27M provincial “caribou program”	The Caribou Program in Condition 18 to the EA Certificate refers to a program of activities that supports the conservation and management of those caribou populations potentially affected by the Project. It is PRGT’s understanding that the Condition would apply to funding towards the new Provincial Coordinated Caribou Program.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response and confirms that the Caribou Program referenced in the Table of Conditions has been replaced with the provincially coordinated Caribou Program.	
61	Doig River First Nation	CMMP 5.1.3 pg 17	Aspen regrowth rates Even in existing mixed forest, it may be beneficial to introduce high density conifer over hardwoods of any type.	Thank you for the comment. As described in the CHRP (Section 6.0 and Section 7.1.2), proposed caribou habitat restoration measures include planting prescriptions that focus on conifer seedlings and shrubs (specifically species that are less palatable to ungulates [i.e., alder]).	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
62	Doig River First Nation	5.2.2 pg 18	Mitigation and offsetting This section may need to be reconciled with current provincial caribou program. Appreciate the intent of effective mitigation, but the document is explicit that “... no change to mitigation would be required...” should measures be effective. This precludes the evolution of MORE effective solutions over time and isn’t necessary to say.	PRGT would consider any advancements in best practices that are proven to be more effective than those already proposed.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
63	Doig River First Nation	CMMP – CHRP 2.1.2 pg 4/68	Limiting factors/predation This more accurately describes the effect linear corridors have on predation rates. It’s about ease of movement, time and energy expended.	Thank you for the comment.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
64	Doig River First Nation	CRHP 2.2.1.2 CWD	CWD access mitigations Where possible, would PRGT consider that baiting and snaring of deadfall/CWD rollbacks etc may decrease predator use? Could be as simple as incenting local trappers.	PRGT is not planning to bait and snare predators or incentivize local trappers to do so; however, these predator control methods could be considered as part of the government-led Caribou Program that PRGT will financially support as required by Condition 18 of the EAC.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	
65	Doig River First Nation	CHRP 2.2.1.3	Vegetation	Should the Project re-establish commercial support to enable a potential Final Investment Decision, PRGT will take all actions	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT’s response.	

		CHRP 2.2.1.5	Consider Twin Sisters Nursery as source for native vegetation replanting. In general, prefer conifer at high density over any shrub or hardwood	necessary to proceed to construction, including consideration of utilizing the Twin Sisters Nursery for the sourcing of native vegetation for replanting. The type of revegetation materials used will align with the literature-based recommendation outlined in the CMMP.		
66	Doig River First Nation	CHRP 7.1.3 Photos page 33	Access control To be effective, the structures in every photo should be feathered in to the remaining timber/canopy. With the exception of the photo on the lower left, this may be somewhat effective with other measures as described (bait and snaring wolves, access regulation and outreach). The lower left is easily circumvented.	PRGT agrees that extending access control measures into the adjacent forest is most effective. In some cases, this requires obtaining additional tenure that is off ROW and this issue has been discussed with OGC. As previously stated, habitat management measures such as bait and snaring wolves and access regulation are outside of PRGT's purview. PRGT recognizes that outreach/education may be helpful in ensuring access controls are kept in place (i.e., effective).	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
67	Doig River First Nation	CHRP 8.1.1	Effectiveness monitoring The timeframe isn't sufficient to really know if mitigations are effective or not. Later in the document (pg 44) there are structural measures discussed instead of strict time limits, but would prefer a serial milestone over a hard deadline for effectiveness.	In alignment with Condition 17, should an analysis of monitoring data at the end of 5 years indicate that mitigations are ineffective (i.e., targets are not being met), then adjustments to mitigation will be necessary (Figure 8-4) and this could include addition years of monitoring as per section 8.4 of the CHRP (Appendix A of the CMMP).	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
68	Doig River First Nation	CHRP 8.1.2 CHRP 8.1.2.4 CHRP 8.1.2.6	Access monitoring For all this effectiveness monitoring, consider partnership with UNBC Would like to see data model and ongoing results for camera trapping effort Once access is created, consider partnership with FLNRO to engage in "game checks" ongoing through moose planning efforts. On the ground compliance and engagement checks with T8, biologists and the public	Thank you for the suggestions relating to UNBC and FLNRORD partnerships. PRGT will consider these suggestions during the implementation of the Access Management Plan. As stated in Section 2.2 of the CMMP, annual results of the effectiveness monitoring program will be provided to Aboriginal groups, including Doig River First Nation, and there will be opportunities to meet and discuss the report findings to solicit feedback.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	
69	Doig River First Nation	Closing comments:	Doig hasn't yet been fully engaged on this project. Moving forward, a comprehensive, inclusive and meaningful consultation process is an appropriate way to address some of the above concerns. Based on discussions with representatives from TCPL, this should include the following commitments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRFN to have an active role in updating and/or implementing the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan in light of current (2019) understandings of the caribou herds and cumulative effects • Opportunity for Aboriginal groups to identify locations and methods of access control to be implemented during construction • Monitoring – PRGT will implement an Aboriginal Construction Monitoring Program to facilitate monitoring of the 	PRGT looks forward to continued engagement with DRFN. As discussed at our meeting, we feel that the commitments outlined in the Caribou Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, Access Management Plan, Reclamation Program and Construction Monitoring Plan provide a useful framework for on-going and meaningful engagement regarding the implementation of these plans.	The EAO is satisfied with PRGT's response.	

			<p>implementation of mitigation measures by Aboriginal groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reclamation Program – detailed reclamation plans, to be developed prior to the end of construction, will be provided to Aboriginal groups for input• Post Construction – Aboriginal groups (through the Construction Monitor) will have an opportunity to participate in PCRMM to determine effectiveness of mitigation measures, and, if required, adaptive management measures and offsets. As well, Aboriginal groups will be provided with PCRMM reporting.• Commitment to meet all regulatory requirements – should legal or regulatory requirements change, PRGT will update its plans to ensure on-going compliance			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--