

**APPENDIX B-6**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE COMMENT TRACKING TABLES**

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Introduction (Pages 2-5 in May version, Pages 2-7 in November version)</b>		
<b>Background</b>		
First Nations and governments should not be referred to as stakeholders.	WMFN <sup>1</sup> 01/08/06 Letter  LGL <sup>2</sup> 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reference to First Nations as “stakeholders” has been removed from the document.</li> </ul>
The term stakeholders should be defined in a glossary following the List of Abbreviations.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will be done in the Application.</li> </ul>
<b>Proponent</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Project Location, Description and Scope</b>		
A reference to Treaty 8 Lands should be included in the description of the location of the MGEC.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reference is included.</li> </ul>
The District of Mackenzie OCP should be referenced by its full title.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan is now referred to as the District of Mackenzie Official Community Plan.</li> </ul>
The scope is limited to facilities and the focus appears to be more on biophysical aspects than socio-economic.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This section describes the physical scope of the project, not the potential scope of project effects.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> West Moberly First Nation

<sup>2</sup> Consultants to McLeod Lake, West Moberly, Sauleau and Fort Nelson First Nations and Treaty 8 Tribal Association

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
Why have planning and reclamations phases not been included in scope? <i>Note: Bruce mentions that he addresses planning in Section 7 of his letter but there is no Section 7 – it goes from 6-8.</i>	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised wording of sentence at top of text box describing the scope of project to be as stated in the Section 11 order, replacing “maintenance and decommissioning” with “dismantling and abandonment”.</li> </ul>
The proposed landfill is absent from the list on page 5.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The landfill is referenced in the second last bullet on page 7 (formerly Page 5).</li> </ul>
<b>Preface (Page 7 in May version, Page 9 in November version)</b>		
A comma should be inserted after First Nations in the fifth bullet of this section.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was done.</li> </ul>
<b>Executive Summary (Page 8 in May version, Page 10 in November version)</b>		
Re 3rd bullet - it must be clear that the consultation being undertaken with First Nations is different than that being undertaken with the public.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been clarified. The nature of consultation undertaken with all interested parties will be described in the Application.</li> </ul>
The executive summary should include a tabular summary of residual effects and their significance.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A tabular summary of the residual effects of the Project and their significance will be included.</li> </ul>
<b>Table of Contents (Pages 9-11 in May version, Pages 11-14 in November version)</b>		
Clarification is needed re headings of 6.3 – Potential Effects on First Nations and 7.3.2 – Project Effects	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table of Contents has been expanded to identify specific First Nations effects that will be addressed in this section.</li> </ul>
Clarification is needed regarding which impacts are being addressed in Section 6 and which in Section 7.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been done.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
An overview of the current environment of the project area, including the area for off-site facilities, e.g. vegetation, watercourses, topography, surficial geological materials, previous disturbance, surrounding development etc. should be included between Sections 5.1 and 5,2 to help set the stage for the following sections.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed sub-section has been added and is now Section 5.2.</li> </ul>
Section 6.3, "Potential Project Effects on First Nations Issues". First Nations prefer the title to read "Potential Adverse Impacts on First Nations' Section 35.1 Rights".	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table of Contents has been expanded to identify specific First Nations effects that will be addressed in this section.</li> </ul>
The headings of Sections 8.3.1 to 8.3.3 would seem to pre-suppose the results of the environmental assessment.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A sub-section has been added to address other impacts as determined from studies.</li> </ul>
<b>List of Abbreviations (Page 12 in May version, Page 15 in November version)</b>		
Recommend that the "List of Abbreviations" in the draft Terms of Reference be expanded to form a glossary of terms, and that the term "stakeholder" is defined within this glossary.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A glossary has been added (Page 16) and additional terms, including "stakeholder", will be defined in the Application.</li> </ul>
<b>Introduction (Page 13 in May version, Page 17 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Proponent Identification</i></b>		
The consultants used in preparing the application should also be listed.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A list of consultants will be included in the Application as indicated in the second bullet point.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Background</i></b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b><i>Project Overview</i></b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
4 <sup>th</sup> bullet should mention First Nations lands.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to First Nations lands has been added in the third bullet.</li> </ul>
A bullet describing potential negative impacts should be added after the 6 <sup>th</sup> bullet.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replaced “economic benefits” with “operating expenses” as this is a descriptive section.</li> </ul>
Describe the site in relation to water bodies and drainage, describe past land use of the project area and past disturbance, and use aerial photos as well as maps to locate the project in its present land use context.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been added in the fifth bullet.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Regulatory Framework</i></b>		
First Nations should be added to the list of governments in the first bullet.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This list is a list of governments with some form of regulatory requirements for the project (i.e. CEAA, BCEAA, municipal zoning).</li> </ul>
<b>Information Distribution and Consultation (Page 14 in May version, Page 18 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Preamble</i></b>		
The term “consultation” should be used with respect to First Nations and “participation” with respect to the public.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per EAO guidelines, the term consultation will be used for all interested parties but it is recognized that the nature of consultation will be different with different parties.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Overview of Public, First Nations and Government Consultation</i></b>		
The word “consultation” in the above heading should be changed to “involvement”.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per EAO guidelines, the term consultation will be used for all interested parties but it is recognized that the nature of consultation will be different with different parties.</li> </ul>
The first bullet should be changed to reflect comments in preamble section.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per EAO guidelines, the term consultation will be used for all interested parties but it is recognized that the nature of consultation will be different with different parties.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Pre-Application Consultation (NOTE: In the November version separate sections have been created for First Nations, Agencies and Public/Stakeholders and each has a sub-section on pre-Application consultation and Planned Future Consultation Activities)</b>		
Commas should separate stakeholder groups and First Nations in the 1st and 2nd bullets.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate sections have been created for First Nations, Agencies and Public/Stakeholders.</li> </ul>
Consultation agreements with First Nations need to be completed before commencing project investigations.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies for the environmental assessment need to proceed in a timely fashion within the time periods specified in the TOR, in accordance with timing requirements for each baseline study. MGEC proposes to continue consultation with First Nations in parallel with project investigations.</li> </ul>
Tracking tables should also reflect comments made by the Crown.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracking sheets will summarize comments received from consultations.</li> </ul>
Comment that any and all consultation procedures and processes must be discussed and mutually agreed to by the First Nations.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will discuss and follow agreed consultation procedures and processes, with guidance from the EAO.</li> </ul>
<b>Planned Future Consultation Activities</b>		
No comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Project Description and Scope of Project (Pages 15-17 in May version, Pages 20-23 in November version)</b>		
<b>Preamble</b>		
Concern expressed regarding use of the words “meaningful assessment” and query as to what will be the defining characteristics of this term in relation to this EIA.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term “meaningful” has been removed.</li> </ul>
Reasoning and justification for geographic scope for various studies require consultation with First Nations.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where First Nations have made specific comments regarding geographic scope, those comments have been considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Background and Rationale</b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
Concern re use of the word “sustainability” in the 2nd bullet and query as to who will define it as it means different things to different people. Note that First Nations have to be involved in its definition.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MGEC will provide information in the Application on the sustainability principles it considered in developing the project design.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Project Location, Alternatives and Site Selection</i></b>		
A clear definition of the phrase “environmentally sensitive areas” is required	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference is to “designated environmentally sensitive areas”: applies to areas designated by government. This will be noted in the Application.</li> </ul>
The criteria and indicators used to select environmentally sensitive areas must be culturally appropriate.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The criteria used to select receptors considered in the evaluation of alternative sites for the project will be explained.</li> </ul>
The second bullet should be rewritten to make it clearer.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has been done.</li> </ul>
Describe the site in relation to water bodies and drainage, describe past land use of the project area and past disturbance, and use aerial photos as well as maps to locate the project in its present land use context.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has been done.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Review of Emission Control Technologies and Emission Limits</i></b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b><i>Project Facilities and Design Information</i></b>		
Comment that although final design level of detail is not required for EA Review process, it may be required to provide full information to First Nations.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment noted.</li> </ul>
Query as to how “footprint” is defined – comment that it must balance perspective of both the social and natural scientists.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term footprint was used in the March 17 version of the TOR but does not appear in the May 26 version and will not be used in the Approved Terms of Reference.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
Any and all off-site effects of the Project must be appropriately included in the SIA.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be done.</li> </ul>
All lands taken up off-site must be identified with GIS whereby shape files are created – this must be created for the main site as well.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The baseline studies will include appropriate mapping of geographical information.</li> </ul>
Details with respect to use must be provided for all lands off-site	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be done.</li> </ul>
A rationale must be provided in regard to the selection of the land for off-site facilities	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be done.</li> </ul>
Duration and frequency of the off-site lands must be provided.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed duration and frequency of use of off-site lands will be provided.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Detailed Project Activities</i></b>		
Comment that proponents should have to provide a bond to cover decommissioning and that it covers expenses related to 3 <sup>rd</sup> party decommissioning and reclamation.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment noted.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Labour Force</i></b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b><i>Business Opportunities (NOTE: In the November version this section has been moved to the socio-economic section.)</i></b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b><i>Project Construction and Operations Costs (NOTE: This section has been added to the November version.)</i></b>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b><i>Alternative Means of Carrying out the Project (CEAA Requirement)</i></b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Scope of Project for EA Purposes</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Scope of Assessment and Study Areas (Pages 18-20 in May version, Pages 24-25 in November version)</b>		
<b>Scope of the Assessment (Introduction)</b>		
Query as to how proponent will define “a reasonable direct causal link”? Concern that “reasonable” and “direct” provide to much latitude to the proponent.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term “causal” was used in the March 17 version of the Draft TOR but does not appear in the May 26 version and will not appear in the Approved TOR. The current wording is “reasonably direct link”.</li> </ul>
Concern re use of the term “causal”	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term “causal” was used in the March 17 version of the Draft TOR but does not appear in the May 26 version and will not appear in the Approved TOR. The current wording is “reasonably direct link”.</li> </ul>
Suggest that the sentence be changed to read “It will focus on the Project’s effects and the potential impacts from them for which a reasonably link can be demonstrate between the Project’s scoped components and the Project setting”.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term “causal” was used in the March 17 version of the Draft TOR but does not appear in the May 26 version and will not appear in the Approved TOR. The current wording is “reasonably direct link”.</li> </ul>
Note that the definition of the terms “scoped components” and “setting” must be agreed to.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scoped components are as per the Section 11 order. The setting is defined by the project disturbed area and study area geographic boundaries in Section 4.2 of the draft TOR.</li> </ul>
Concern re sentence “The Application will primarily focus on effects for which the Proponent has the ability to directly implement impact management measures to mitigate the concern” in that it does not seem to protect Section 35 rights.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Section 6 of the TOR addresses Traditional Land Use and Knowledge and Treaty Rights.</li> </ul>
Concern that above sentence seems to be limiting nature of assessment.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The statement is in the preamble and does not limit the nature of the assessment defined in the TOR.</li> </ul>
Concern that mitigation acceptable to one group may not be acceptable to another.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultation process will be used to help identify such concerns and efforts will be made by MGEC to resolve such conflicts, with guidance from the EAO.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
First Nations must be consulted on whether mitigation is required and the form it should take.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MGEC will consult with First Nations on impacts of the project and consider their views on whether mitigation is required and the form it should take.</li> </ul>
Concern that “reasonable” and “direct” provide too much latitude to the proponent.. MGEC response does not address the comment adequately. The current wording is “reasonably direct link”, having dropped the word causal, yet still does not address the question raised by WMFN.	LGL 20/12/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted, MGEC has removed the word "causal" as previously requested. The proponent feels that the use of the words "reasonable" and "direct" do not provide latitude, rather they define the objective of determining of impacts in a concerted manner.</li> </ul>

<b>Defining Study Areas for Assessment Purposes</b>		
Concerns of First Nations must be considered when defining study area boundaries and “rationale” for adopting each boundary must explain how First Nations concerns were incorporated or why they were not.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation on the TOR addresses the scope of the baseline studies. Discussions with First Nations helped refine the scope and rationale of boundaries for studies of traditional use and traditional knowledge.</li> </ul>
First Nations must be consulted regarding “the timeframes over which the effects” will result in impacts.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed timeframes for effects are as indicated in the TOR and will include from project construction through to project dismantling and abandonment and clarified in Section 4.3.</li> </ul>
The proponent must create spatial boundaries that are aligned with cultural variables.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MGEC believes the boundaries proposed are appropriate for baseline studies and assessing potential impacts.</li> </ul>
In terms of “zone of influence” and “expected to be non-detectable” – the manner in which First Nations would define “influence” and non-detectable” must be considered.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a matter that the EAO could assess during its review of the Application.</li> </ul>
The definition of the “footprint” should include both social and biophysical elements of the project.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term footprint was used in the March 17 version of the TOR but does not appear in the May 26 version and will not be used in the Approved Terms of Reference.</li> </ul>
Need to be clear re term footprint and its relation to spatial boundaries in biophysical and social studies.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term footprint was used in the March 17 version of the TOR but does not appear in the May 26 version and will not be used in the Approved Terms of Reference.</li> </ul>

<b>Scope of Assessment</b>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b><i>Study Area Geographic Boundaries</i></b>		
Query as to whether “geophysical project footprint “ includes land fill and other off-site locations.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term footprint was used in the March 17 version of the TOR but does not appear in the May 26 version and will not be used in the Approved Terms of Reference. The project disturbed area does include the landfill and the right-of-ways for off-site pipelines and power lines.</li> </ul>
Regarding air quality – how was 25 km zone determined – reasoning must be provided.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preamble indicates that a rationale will be provided.</li> </ul>
Noise radius omits issues around increased traffic – radius cannot be determined until traffic patterns are assessed.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main sources of noise will be equipment operated at the plant and the study area is large enough to assess the effect of this equipment in addition to background noise levels. This study area also includes public and private roads that will be used by trucks delivering wood fuel to the site and near which the effects of this traffic on noise would be largest.</li> </ul>
Justification for limiting aquatic life and wildlife boundary to that of the project footprint when other areas are much wider.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbances to aquatic life will be very limited because effluents requiring treatment will be treated at the Pope &amp; Talbot and runoff not requiring treatment will flow off site. Disturbance of habitat will only occur in the area on which facilities are constructed. The study area boundaries have been adjusted based on the comments received.</li> </ul>
Comment that archaeology footprint must be larger than project footprint to capture things like “spirits” and Elders must be involved at appropriate times of year – not winter.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A bullet point has been added to address Traditional Use and Traditional Knowledge studies.</li> </ul>
Socio-economic study area must be larger than District of Mackenzie.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study area will include First Nations communities for First Nations specific impacts.</li> </ul>
Provide aerial photographs, or satellite imagery, as well as topographical maps of study area.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3.2 has been amended to include aerial photography in addition to maps and plans showing the project location and surrounding area. Satellite imagery is not considered necessary.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<p>The Project Disturbed Area includes for the First Nations the roads used to transport the wood waste. These roads travel through high value wildlife habitat. The increased traffic has the potential to impact the wildlife (e.g., highway mortality, wildlife movement and reproduction). The roads are mentioned as impacts (7.5) in the social-economic section but are not mentioned in the Environmental Effects section.</p>	<p>LGL 08/08/06 Letter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As discussed at the meeting with First Nations July 13, the TOR has been modified to address concerns about the risk to wildlife from trucks transporting wood to the plant on public and resource roads.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Study Temporal Boundaries</i></b>		
<p>Comment that VECs identified must be appropriate to the area (including people) in which the project is occurring.</p>	<p>WMFN 01/08/06 Letter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VECs will be determined according to the definition in the approved terms of reference.</li> </ul>
<p>In the “Coverage” column, the proponent has described the timing of various baseline studies which is not what is normally meant by “temporal boundaries” in Environmental Impact Assessments. Temporal boundaries are normally meant to define the time period over which environmental impacts will be expected and predicted (e.g., construction, operations and decommissioning).</p>	<p>LGL 08/08/06 Letter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The information on the temporal boundaries of baseline studies was added at the request of the EAO and the Working Group.</li> <li>The TOR has been amended in Section 4.3 to state the timeframes for assessing effects will include construction, operation, dismantling and abandonment.</li> </ul>
<p>Vegetation, aquatic life and wildlife; field studies done only in May/June may not be sufficient to provide good baseline descriptions of these environmental components. Consider conducting surveys in May through July and again in the fall (September and October – fall migration period). Winter surveys should also be conducted (e.g., wildlife track surveys). The project has the potential to impact furbearers adjacent to the plant, and vehicle traffic could impact wildlife.</p>	<p>LGL 08/08/06 Letter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September/October studies have been added for migratory birds.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Effects (Pages 21-26 in May version, Pages 26-33 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Preamble</i></b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
Query as to whether VECs are an appropriate means of assessing concerns of First Nations.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of VECs is accepted practice for environmental assessment. The approaches used in the study of traditional uses and traditional knowledge will involve input from First Nations.</li> </ul>
Query as to whether VEC's are culturally sensitive.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of VECs is accepted practice for environmental assessment. The approaches used in the study of traditional uses and traditional knowledge will involve input from First Nations.</li> </ul>
Indicators and data sources used to assess Project impacts must take into account variables unique to a First Nation culture.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The approaches used in the study of traditional uses and traditional knowledge will involve input from First Nations.</li> </ul>
How will the Crown ensure natural justice is upheld if the Proponent is identifying the potential effects?	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EAO to address.</li> </ul>
<b><i>General Approach and Methods</i></b>		
How will the proponent rate the significance of effects on a First Nations culture?	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After completion of the traditional use and traditional knowledge studies, MGEC will request from First Nations a non-confidential summary of their views on the impacts of the project for inclusion in the Application.</li> </ul>
Table 1 contains various terms and phrases that need to be justified and clearly defined.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The table defines the categories that will be used to characterize the level of impact after mitigation. Background for these levels and definitions of uncommon terms used will be provided in the Application.</li> </ul>
The proponent should also provide an indication of the confidence with which each residual effect is predicted.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The confidence in the findings will be indicated through the description of methods, data and assumptions used for the assessment and, where significant to the findings, a statement of limitations or data gaps. Confidence in the findings will not be quantified statistically due to the difficulty of such analysis and lack of a consistent means of doing such analysis across the wide range of VECs that will be assessed.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
The proponent states that the definitions used in Table 1 will be used to rate the significance of residual effects. The ratings used in Table 1 are descriptors of level of impact, not significance. A residual effect is either significant or it is not. The proponent should detail in the application how the descriptors magnitude, duration, frequency, reversibility and extent are rated and combined to determine significance.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wording has been changed to correctly refer to Table 1.</li> <li>The approach used to determine significance of residual effects will be explained in the Application.</li> </ul>
We require more information regarding number of days and duration of proposed survey.	LGL 20/12/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Fall sampling period of 5 days duration will be conducted in September/October, with guidance from government agencies on the use of the local wetland by migratory birds.</li> </ul>
No response has been provided with regards to the suggestion of winter track surveys.	LGL 20/12/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TOR baseline study scope includes observations of wildlife in Summer and Fall. This is considered adequate field investigation for the baseline study for MGEC.</li> </ul>

<b>Overview of Current Environment of the Project Area (NOTE: This section was added to the November version)</b>		
<b>Geophysical Environment</b>		
Should also include a description of any previous disturbance, land use, soil contamination etc.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been added.</li> </ul>
<b>Air Quality</b>		
Comment that pollution will be moving from one area to another without compensation for those in the new area.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted.</li> </ul>
Baseline data and dispersion modeling of impacts for fine particulate matter (PM2.5) should also be provided as the fine particulates may pose a greater threat to human health than the coarse particulates (PM10 or larger).	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will be done.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
The assessment should also include any microclimatic effects from heat loss/discharge, particularly related to fog and airport use.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended the study boundaries and assessment of effects to include modeling of the effect of water vapour emissions from the MGEC cooling tower on the frequency of ground-level fog within 3 km.</li> </ul>
Best and worst case scenarios should be provided when identifying and characterizing predicted air emissions as well as estimated level of confidence for the predictions.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scenarios to be used for assessing impacts of air emissions are indicated in Section 5.4 and incorporate the cases requested by the BC Ministry of Environment.</li> <li>The assessment of impacts on air quality will follow methods and use assumptions agreed to in advance with the BC Ministry of Environment. The confidence in the predictions will not be quantified.</li> </ul>
Ensure that the effects of all potential fuels (e.g., kraft soap, clarifier sludge) are considered.	MLIB 11/12/06 E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following wording has been added to Section 5.4.2 “including effects of the proposed blend of Wood Residue, Kraft soap and clarifier sludge (Scenario 2)”.</li> </ul>

<b>Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Noise</b>		
We assume that these analyses include modeling of noise levels at various distances from plant.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Aquatic Habitat and Fauna</b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<p>Bird use of these wetlands needs to be examined in more than May and June. For instance are there staging areas during the fall migration? Are the only wetlands likely to be affected those “within 200 m to the southeast” or are there more wetlands within the vicinity? If so, all wetlands should be classified based on the provincial classification system and their distribution mapped based on aerial photographs. Adverse impacts on migratory birds should also be evaluated in relation to provisions of the Migratory Birds Convention Act and its associated regulations.</p>	<p>LGL 08/08/06 Letter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A fall study period has been added.</li> </ul>
<b>Vegetation</b>		
<p>The baseline survey should include an ecosystem map showing the distribution of plant communities that occur based on aerial photographic interpretations and ground truthing. This ecosystem map should show the distribution of plant communities of both terrestrial and wetland associations. An ecosystem map can also be used to for habitat mapping to create wildlife habitat suitability ratings mentioned in section 5.9.</p>	<p>LGL 08/08/06 Letter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has been done.</li> </ul>
<b>Wildlife Habitat and Species</b>		
<p>No comments.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Archaeology, Culture and Heritage</b>		
<p>Important that field assessments be undertaken in the area, including the secondary zone and that the studies not be done in winter or when the ground is frozen.</p>	<p>WMFN 01/08/06 Letter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The studies will be undertaken prior to snowfall and First Nations individuals will be invited to be on-site during the investigations.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use Context</b>		
<p>No comments.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Accidents and Malfunctions (CEAA Requirement)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Hazards and the Effects of the Environment on the Project (CEAA Requirement)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Summary of Residual Effect and Their Significance (Heading in November version)</b> <b>Summary of Project Impacts, Mitigation Requirements and Residual Effects (Heading in May version)</b>		
<p>The proponent states that the definitions used in Table 1 will be used to rate the significance of residual effects. The ratings used in Table 1 are descriptors of level of impact, not significance. A residual effect is either significant or it is not. The proponent should detail in the application how the descriptors magnitude, duration, frequency, reversibility and extent are rated and combined to determine significance.</p>	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term “significance” has been removed.</li> </ul>
<b>First Nations (Page 27 in May version, Pages 34-35 in November version)</b>		
<b>First Nations Setting</b>		
Capitalize “Nations” in first bullet.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was done.</li> </ul>
Concern as to how proponent will identify “environmental values of interest to First Nations.”	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wording has been changed to indicate that values will be identified by First Nations.</li> </ul>
Should include description of general land use in area by First Nations, traditional territories as well as reserves and social, cultural, and environmental values of First Nations.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be done.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Socio-economic Baseline</b>		
Concern that a full assessment of socio-economic impacts with relation to First Nations is not being done and with the manner in which First Nations studies are generally undertaken.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All areas considered for the general population will be assessed for First Nations with First Nations specific impacts being identified in the First Nations section of the Application.</li> </ul>
<b>Potential Effects on First Nations Issues</b> (Heading in May Version, no longer in November version as the following specific sections have been added.)		
<b>Traditional Land Use and Knowledge</b> (Heading added to November version)		
<b>Treaty Rights</b> (Heading added to November version)		
<b>Employment and Income</b> (Heading added to November version)		
<b>Business Opportunities</b> (Heading added to November version)		
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b> (Heading added to November version)		
First Nations prefer the title "Potential Adverse Impacts on First Nations' Section 35.1 Rights".	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Section has been changed to identify the areas with First Nations specific impacts which will be addressed in this section of the Application. As noted above, new headings in this section are Traditional Land Use and Knowledge, Treaty Rights, Employment and Income, Business Opportunities, Transportation and Traffic.</li> </ul>
Bullet 1 - this non-confidential summary will be subject to an information sharing agreement with the First Nations.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Bullet 3 - First Nations people have both aboriginal and treaty rights under Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed in TOR.</li> </ul>
<b>Socio-economic Effects</b> (Pages 28-29 in May version, Pages 36-37 in November version)		
<b>General Approach and Methods</b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Overview of Local and Regional Setting</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Employment, Income and Government Revenues</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Population (Added to the November version)</b>		
<b>Business Opportunities (Was in Project Description section in May version)</b>		
<b>Housing</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>		
The traffic assessment should include an assessment of the impacts of traffic on wildlife.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is addressed in the First Nations and wildlife sections.</li> </ul>
<b>Emergency Services</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Public Health</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Utility Services</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Cumulative Environmental Effects Assessment (CEAA Requirement) (Page 30 in May version, Page 38 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Methods and Scoping of Cumulative Environmental Effects</i></b>		
Cumulative effect and cumulative impact assessment must be defined.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will be done.</li> </ul>
First Nations variables must be considered in CEA.	WMFN 01/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is presently indicated in Section 8 for First Nations specific effects determined likely to occur.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Existing and Future Projects Includes in the CEA</i></b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b><i>Assessment of Impacts, Mitigation and Residual Effects</i></b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b><i>Summary</i></b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Management Program (Page 31 in May version, Page 39 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Component Environmental Management Plans</i></b>		
First Nations must be engaged in all monitoring activities and must be involved in assessing permit compliance based on the results of the monitoring programs. First Nations must also be consulted on permits, or permit amendments, required for this project.	LGL 08/08/06 Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First Nations will be involved in monitoring associated with the Archaeological Resources Monitoring Plan, if such a plan is required by the Archaeological Branch.</li> <li>Involvement of First Nations in other monitoring plans will be subject to the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Certificate and agency permits.</li> </ul>
<b>Summary of Commitments (Page 40 - added to November version)</b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
 Responses to First Nations Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Conclusions (Page 32 in May version, Page 41 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>List of References and Supporting Documents (Page 33 in May version, Page 42 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to Agency Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Introduction (Pages 2-5 in May version, Pages 2-7 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Project Location, Description and Scope</i></b>		
To my understanding, the MGEC will be using Pope and Talbot's sanitary sewer, effluent and water systems. Will Pope and Talbot's systems be able to function adequately with the incoming demands?	Public Health Protection - Northern Health 28/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of the Pope and Talbot infrastructure is stated in the Scope of Project and the interaction will be described in Section 3.4 of the Application – Project Facilities and Design. The ability of the Pope and Talbot's systems to function with the incoming demands from MGEC for process and sanitary effluent treatment and water supply will be assessed in Section 5 of the Application.</li> </ul>
<b>Preface (Page 7 in May version, Page 9 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Executive Summary (Page 8 in May version, Page 10 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Table of Contents (Pages 9-11 in May version, Pages 11-14 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>List of Abbreviations (Page 12 in May version, Page 15 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Introduction (Page 13 in May version, Page 17 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to Agency Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Information Distribution and Consultation (Page 14 in May version, Page 18 in November version)</b>		
No comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Project Description and Scope of Project (Pages 15-17 in May version, Pages 20-23 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Review of Emission Control Technologies and Emission Limits</i></b>		
Review emission control technologies and discuss proposed limits.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be done in Section 3.3</li> </ul>
<b><i>Project Facilities and Design Information</i></b>		
Plans and speculations showing how the sanitary sewer will accurately function with the incoming effluent will be needed.	Public Health Protection-Northern Health 28/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be described in Section 3.4.1 in regard to design aspects and in Section 5.7 in regard to impacts of project effluent streams on receiving water quality.</li> </ul>
Address onsite hog fuel handling and storage – associated environmental concerns would include fugitive dust, leachate, and surface runoff.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be addressed in Section 5.4 (Air quality), Section 5.7 (Water Quality) and Section 5.14 (Waste management). An environmental management plan for air quality and dust control will be included.</li> </ul>
Address ash handling, storage and disposal – the disposal plan should include a section on wood ash quality and an assessment of whether this material is a hazardous waste, and if so, include a proposal for handling and disposal of ash as a hazardous waste. If the ash is not a hazardous waste then the landfill disposal proposal should be specifically assessed and a proposal for site management included in the report.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be addressed in Section 5.14 (Waste management).</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to Agency Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
<b>Scope of Assessment and Study Areas (Pages 18-20 in May version, Pages 24-25 in November version)</b>		
No comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Effects (Pages 21-26 in May version, Pages 26-33 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Air Quality</i></b>		
The Modeling Plan should indicate what contaminants will be modeled.	Environmental Quality Section – Ministry of Environment 30/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The modeling plan and Section 5.4 of the revised terms of reference identify the contaminants to be modeled.</li> </ul>
We are requesting that, in addition to showing isopleths of maximum predicted concentrations for each modeled pollutant, you determine the predicted increase or decrease in the frequencies of exceedance of 50 and 25ug/m <sup>3</sup> PM <sub>10</sub> , and of 30 and 15 ug/m <sup>3</sup> PM <sub>2.5</sub> . We are requesting results for half the objective values for these two pollutants so we can determine the effect on current baseline levels more accurately than by just examining the probability of exceeding the objectives, which are relatively rare events.	Environmental Quality Section – Ministry of Environment 30/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 5.4 of the revised terms of reference includes analysis of the predicted increase or decrease in frequencies of exceedance of the 50 and 25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>10</sub> and of 30 and 15 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>2.5</sub>, as requested.</li> </ul>
To assess the effect on PM <sub>2.5</sub> baseline levels, we recommend that you use a transplanted baseline from Fort St. John.	Environmental Quality Section – Ministry of Environment 30/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revised terms of reference includes use of a transplanted baseline for PM<sub>2.5</sub> from Fort St. John in conjunction with baseline PM<sub>2.5</sub> data from monitoring in Mackenzie done by Pope &amp; Talbot in 2006.</li> </ul>
Identify and assess all air discharge contaminants of concern and the respective discharge sources.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emission discharge contaminants of concern that will be assessed are listed in Section 5.4.2.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to Agency Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
Include a discussion or proposal for compliance assurance monitoring for the major emission source.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 5.4.3 will describe the compliance assurance monitoring proposed.</li> </ul>
Address air quality impacts as proposed and as further indicated in the Environmental Quality Section response.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been done as per the first three comments in this section.</li> </ul>
Ensure the effects assessment is done through dispersion modeling.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 13/12/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The statement in Section 5.4.2 have been changed to read as follows – Predict, using dispersion modeling, the effects of emissions from the Project's wood-fired boiler on ambient concentrations</li> </ul>

<b>Water Quality</b>		
Once the Centre is operational, water samples will need to be collected monthly in addition to those already collected by Pope and Talbot.	Public Health Protection-Northern Health 28/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed monitoring activities for effluents, surface water and ground water will be described in Section 5.7.3 and in the Surface Water Quality and Sediment Control Plan for Construction and the Water Quality/Quantity Management Plan.</li> </ul>
Address process effluent treatment and disposal. This should include the main process effluent, and other sources such as maintenance shop liquid effluents that might be contaminated with hydrocarbons. With respect to effluent discharges to the Pope & Talbot treatment system it is noted that the impact of the addition of the MGEC discharges on the P&T system will be addressed.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Treatment and disposal of process and other sources of effluent will be addressed in Section 5.7 as requested.</li> </ul>
Address groundwater monitoring and assessment issues as they relate to both the hog storage area and the landfill site.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groundwater monitoring and assessment will be addressed in Section 5.7, as requested.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to Agency Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
Pope and Talbot currently supplies bottled water for drinking purposes, will MGEC do the same?	Public Health Protection-Northern Health 28/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed source of drinking water will be described in Section 3.5.3.</li> </ul>
<b>First Nations (Page 27 in May version, Pages 34-35 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Socio-economic Effects (Pages 28-29 in May version, Pages 36-37 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Housing</i></b>		
I would also like to request detailed information on any food services or accommodations which will be provided for employees.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employee housing will be addressed in Section 7.6.</li> </ul>
<b>Cumulative Environmental Effects Assessment (CEAA Requirement) (Page 30 in May version, Page 38 in November version)</b>		
No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Management Program (Page 31 in May version, Page 39 in November version)</b>		
<b><i>Component Environmental Management Plans</i></b>		
Also, will I be able to receive copies of the following plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Surface Water Quality and Sediment Control Plan</li> <li>- Construction Waste Management Plan</li> <li>- Air Quality and Dust Control Plan</li> <li>- Water Quality/Quantity Monitoring Plan</li> <li>- Hazardous Waste Management Spill Plan</li> </ul>	Public Health Protection-Northern Health 28/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMPs developed to a conceptual level of detail will be provided in the Application.</li> </ul>

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
Responses to Agency Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
Address hazardous waste management for all onsite hazardous materials.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will be addressed in Section 5.14 (Waste Management)</li> </ul>
Address spill response plan and contingency planning.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 9.1 includes a Spill Prevention and Contingency Plan.</li> </ul>
Address scrap metal handling and recycling.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed in Section 5.14.</li> </ul>
Address a domestic waste handling and disposal proposal including solid (office/lunch room type refuse) and liquid sewage effluent.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed in Section 5.14.</li> </ul>
Address surface runoff management and sediment control.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed in Section 5.7 (Water Quality) and in Section 9.1, Surface Water Quality and Sediment Control Plan.</li> </ul>
The Environmental Management Plans for construction, and later for operations as proposed in Section 9, should include a component on staff and contractor training (i.e., training of workers on the site with respect to hazardous wastes, and emergency response), and indicated the level of authority of the staff members responsible for implementing the plan.	Environmental Protection Division – Ministry of Environment 29/06/06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A commitment to provide or require appropriate training of staff or contractors, and the authority of staff responsible for implementation of the EMPs will be provided in the EMPs listed in Section 9.1,</li> </ul>
<b>Summary of Commitments (Page 40 - added to November version)</b>		

**Mackenzie Green Energy Project**  
 Responses to Agency Comments on the draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Group/Means	MGELP Response
---------	-------------	----------------

<b>Conclusions (Page 32 in May version, Page 41 in November version)</b>		
--	--	--

No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
--------------	--	---

<b>List of References and Supporting Documents (Page 33 in May version, Page 42 in November version)</b>		
--	--	--

No comments.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
--------------	--	---