

Compiled Reviewer Comments, Proponent Responses, Board Staff Response, and SCML Response to Board

February 29, 2016

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
4	CPAWS - NT Chapter: Kris Brekke	Sec. 4.2.2 Pg. 25 Harvesting and Hunting	<p>Comment It is very important that this section not be only dependent on historical and existing harvesting activities. It must also be forward looking. The road upgrade could significantly increase access for hunters and it is likely that available harvest data is very limited now because GNWT hunting regulations do not yet require mandatory harvest reporting. An estimate of future harvest pressure that considers real scenarios were road access has increased harvest of mountain caribou such as at the Canol Trail may provide a more certain view of future potential impacts.</p> <p>Recommendation Update statement describing section 4.2.2 : "SCML will provide a description of historical, existing and a consideration of future harvesting activities"... And add bullet : • Impact of potential future harvest activities with a</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION The access for hunting purposes is pre-existing and will not be changed by the project, except for limiting traffic during the operational phase for safety reasons. The HPAR is a public road. The permits applied for that triggered this environmental assessment start from the current time and current access for hunting is part of the existing conditions. As noted in Table 5 (see Traditional Land Use and Harvesting VC and Road, Lake and River Access and Use VC) the Developer's Proposed Terms of Reference includes the consideration of future harvesting activities in the context of increased hunter access, but depending on decisions made about the road's reclamation post-closure. Section 4.2.2 refers to baseline conditions which addresses historic and existing harvesting</p>	<p>Relevant sections on harvesting capture concerns expressed by CPAWS and reflect the scope of assessment, as per ToR section 3.2. Past and existing effects are considered in the TOR with respect to how they are impacted by the project.</p>	<p>While SCML agrees that past and existing effects of harvest form part of the assessment, we caution that there is little information available on past levels of harvest along the road corridor. The road has been accessible for hunting and fishing since its construction. Access to the road is currently not managed and not monitored. As indicated in the Project Description Report, access will need to be managed for safety reasons during the project lifetime, and the regulators will have the opportunity to allow for control of access during and after the life of the proposed Selwyn mine.</p>

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			consideration of scenarios where a road has increased hunter access to mountain caribou	<p>activities. Section 7.9 indicates that SCML will evaluate potential impacts of road closure (depending on decisions made regarding reclamation) on harvesting activities.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION No change recommended based on this comment.</p>		
3	Dehcho First Nations: Carrie Breneman	1. Key Lines of Inquiry	<p>With respect to the benefit and effect on communities, DFN supports the comments made by NDDDB as they have been directly involved in the scoping sessions and have had direct discussions with Selwyn-Chihong and MVEIRB. We agree with NDDDB that the section of the ToR on Benefits and Effects on Communities should include more detailed valued components. These detailed value components should include: economic benefit and well-being, distribution of benefits, training and skill development, community wellness and community confidence and influence over the project. DFN also supports NDDDB recommendations for more detailed information and inquiry into economic effects and wellbeing. Specifically, DFN supports NDDDB work towards</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION SCML considers the benefits and effects of the project on communities as a Key line of inquiry. This will ensure that a comprehensive analysis is undertaken. SCML intends to complete the analysis of the effects of the project on employment and contracting opportunities; wage and salary income; training and skills development; business opportunities and overall community wellness as separate and distinct evaluations as described in Section 7.13 of the Developer’s Proposed Terms of Reference. This scope addresses the issues identified by the reviewer.</p> <p>Issues such as employment targets will be considered in the</p>	Updates made to TOR capture both perspectives without being too onerous on SCML. See sections 3.3 and 3.4 for requirements for geographic and temporal scopes.	The Board has increased the scope of the assessment that will be required in the DAR. While we understand the comment, SCML is concerned about the level of expectation and the appropriate alignment of assessment scope given this is a road upgrade project.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			<p>identifying employment targets, analyzing what barriers there may be to achieve those targets, reducing barriers and tracking success toward meeting those targets.</p>	<p>design of SCML’s socio-economic initiatives. The Cooperation Agreements between SCML and potentially affected communities and any further SCML-Community Agreements to be developed as part of the Project are the mechanisms by which the reviewer’s issues are being addressed by SCML.</p> <p>SCML notes that it has formal Cooperation Agreements with both Sahtu and Dehcho communities that cover the life of the Project. These communities have been involved in the HPAR project in every step along the way and will continue to be involved.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION No change recommended based on this comment.</p>		
13	Dehcho First Nations: Carrie Breneman	7. Alternatives within the project	<p>Comment DFN remains concerned regarding the traffic volumes proposed along the HPAR. Recommendation DFN recommends that Selwyn provide a consideration of seasonal decreases in transportation volume or actions that may trigger decreases in transportation.</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION This will be considered in the Alternatives Assessment (Section 8.2- Alternatives within the Project and 8.3-Alternatives Analysis).</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION No change recommended based</p>	Seasonal effects on traffic volume are included in the TOR. See section 5.2.1.4 (3) and 6.2.12.2 (3).	The original comment by DFN was related to consideration of mitigation measures for impacts on caribou that include seasonal or overall decreases in vehicle frequency along the HPAR during the period of concentrate hauling. SCML will, as indicated in the previous response, address these potential

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
				on this comment.		mitigation measures in the Alternatives Assessment (Section 8).
2	GNWT - Lands: Paul Mercredi	p.10, Section 1.4 - Legal context of Terms of Reference/scope of development; pdf-page 179 (text-page 165) of the Project Description Report (Public Registry item #9).	<p>Comment In the PDR, SCML appears to state that portions of the proposed project "could potentially be exempted from Part 5, which covers matters pertaining to the [MVEIRB]" under "section 157.1 of the MVRMA."</p> <p>Recommendation For and fairness for all parties, GNWT requests either that SCML clarify this statement, and its applicability to this proceeding, or that the MVEIRB indicate definitively the applicability or not, to any extent, of MVRMA section 157.1 to this proceeding.</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>Section 3.1 of the Developer's Proposed Terms of Reference describes the scope of the development that is subject to a review under the MVRMA. As indicated in the HPAR Upgrade Project Description Report (June 2015) (Section 9.1) and reflected in the Developer's Proposed Terms of Reference, SCML will not be assessing construction impacts of already built structures or components which are exempt under Section 157.1 of the MVRMA.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>The Terms of Reference should make direct reference to the February 27, 2006 MVLWB Staff Report, where the Board recognized that certain activities related to the HPAR are exempt from Part 5 of the MVRMA under provisions of Section 157.1. This includes activities that were assessed and then permitted under Land Use Permits and Water Licenses prior to the establishment of the</p>	157.1 does not apply to the HPAR upgrade EA. The ToR will not make reference to the 2006 decision as it is not relevant to this EA. The use of existing infrastructure will be considered in this EA. Any past effects from the existing HPAR will be considered in the assessment of cumulative effects.	SCML understands that the assessment of previously approved and developed HPAR infrastructure, including the bridges, is outside the scope of the current assessment. SCML also understands that use of existing HPAR infrastructure will be assessed.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
				Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act.		
5	GNWT - Lands: Paul Mercredi	Voice - p. 48, Section 9, Cumulative Effects	<p>Comment The final paragraph summarizes the developer's views.</p> <p>Recommendation Remove last paragraph from section '9 Cumulative Effects.' GNWT acknowledges that MVEIRB may choose to provide direction on these matters in the final TOR.</p>	<p>RATONALE</p> <p>The Developer's Proposed Terms of Reference is based on SCML's experience in conducting cumulative effects assessment, available guidance material and past EA practice in the NWT. In this case, the consideration of beneficial effects, the effects of accidents and malfunctions and the effects of the environment on the project are not considered to be appropriate subjects for consideration in a cumulative effects assessment.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>No change recommended based on this comment.</p>	Noted, addressed in ToR	Based on SCML's experience in conducting cumulative effects assessment, available guidance material and past EA practice in the NWT, the consideration of beneficial effects, the effects of accidents and malfunctions, and the effects of the environment on the project are not normally considered in a cumulative effects assessment.
6	GNWT - Lands: Paul Mercredi	Voice	<p>Comment At various places, there appears to be instructions for 'discussion of risk,' as opposed to a quantitative (and where appropriate qualitative) presentation of impacts (be they beneficial or adverse) to the environment from the development. This is apparent most in the first Key line of inquiry.</p> <p>Recommendation Throughout the Terms of Reference change to</p>	<p>SCML agrees with the reviewer's comment</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>The Terms of Reference should be reviewed to ensure the term "risk" is used in the context of an assessment of potential accidents and malfunctions (e.g., the risk of spills, geohazards) rather than environmental effects.</p>	Noted, addressed in ToR. The final ToR will direct the developer to conduct a quantitative and where appropriate, qualitative, risk assessment. This will be made explicit through the description of requirements for the KLOI of Accidents and Malfunctions.	The Board has provided detailed guidance regarding the assessment of potential accidents and malfunctions that will assist SCML in undertaking its analysis.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			language that best fosters a robust and balanced presentation of impacts from the development.			
16	GNWT - Lands: Paul Mercredi	Page 16 – Table 2 - Valued Components – Wildlife and wildlife habitat	<p>Comment The project may have impacts on more than just the Nahanni Caribou Herd. Adjacent herds (Redstone Mountain Caribou and Finlayson Herds) might be impacted by the project (Reference COSEWIC Report - http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/cosewic/sr_Caribou_Northern_Central_Southern_2014_e.pdf).</p> <p>Recommendation Change from “Northern mountain woodland caribou (Nahanni Caribou Herd)” to “Northern mountain woodland caribou” in the scope of assessment.</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION The Finlayson herd is potentially affected by the proposed Selwyn mine in areas to the west of the mine, but its range is not along the HPAR and it is not potentially affected by the HPAR. The Redstone herd is well to the north and is not potentially affected. There is no evidence that these herds overlap with the study area.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Maintain the focus on the Nahanni Caribou Herd for the Key line of inquiry (do not replace this with “northern mountain woodland caribou”)</p>	The KLOI includes effects to all caribou. The focus is maintained on the Nahanni Caribou Herd.	SCML agrees with the Board Staff Response in regards to the assessment of caribou.
21	GNWT - Lands: Paul Mercredi	Page 17 - 3.2.4 - Key Lines of Inquiry	<p>Comment The project may have impacts on more than just the Nahanni Caribou Herd. Adjacent herds (Redstone Mountain Caribou and Finlayson Herds) might be impacted by the project (Reference COSEWIC Report - http://www.sararegistry.gc.ca/virtual_sara/files/cosewic/sr_Caribou_Northern_Central_Southern_2014_e.pdf).</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION The Finlayson herd is potentially affected by the proposed Selwyn mine in areas to the west of the mine, but its range is not along the HPAR and it is not potentially affected by the HPAR. The Redstone herd is well to the north and is not potentially affected. There is no evidence</p>	The KLOI includes effects to all caribou. The focus is maintained on the Nahanni Caribou Herd.	SCML agrees with the Board Staff Response in regards to the assessment of caribou.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			<p>4_e.pdf).</p> <p>Recommendation Change the Key line of inquiry from "Nahanni Caribou Herd" to "Northern mountain woodland caribou" to ensure that all caribou herds that overlap with the study area are included in the assessment.</p>	<p>that these herds overlap with the study area.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Maintain the focus on the Nahanni Caribou Herd for the Key line of inquiry (do not replace this with "northern mountain woodland caribou")</p>		
36	GNWT - Lands: Paul Mercredi	7.1.4 "Benefits and effects on communities"	<p>Comment Regardless of the size of development, under MVRMA subsection 115(1), the MVEIRB is required to assess all proposed developments for impacts on the environment [be they beneficial or adverse impacts], in a way that considers the legislated requirement for the EA process to "have regard for the protection of the social, cultural and economic well being of residents and communities in the Mackenzie Valley." GNWT notes that while the baseline section of the Terms of Reference [section 4.2.7] lists "rates of crime and substance abuse," no assessment of those rates against the MVEIRB's mandate in the context of this development appear in section 7. Recommendation Add (a) line item(s) concerning socio-economic impact assessment (be they beneficial or adverse</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION Section 7.13 includes the consideration of the potential for adverse effects on overall community wellness, which is sufficiently broad in scope to allow for the consideration of potential changes in rates of crime and substance abuse associated with the HPAR project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION No change recommended based on this comment.</p>	ToR Section 6.1.4.6, Human Health and Wellbeing, includes a consideration of the GNWT's recommendation.	The Board has increased the scope of the assessment that will be required for Section 6.1.4 (Effects on Communities). SCML is concerned about the level of expectation and the appropriate alignment in terms of scope as noted in the GNWT comment, given this is a road upgrade project.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			impacts) to list in section 7.1.4. GNWT notes that the scope of assessment and geographic scope should align appropriately with the new line item.			
29	Gov of Canada: Sarah Robertson	GoC - EC #23 Section 7: Assesment of Environmental Impacts and Cumulative Effects, 7.1.2 Accidents and Malfunctions	Comment EC notes that several clarifications with regard to environmental emergency planning and response are needed. Recommendation The first bullet should be changed from “risk assessment” to “Hazard Identification and Quantitative Risk Assessment”; and to the second bullet add “...and contributing and/or complicating factors”.	RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION A Quantitative risk assessment implies there are accepted methods for this approach. As an example, there are accepted quantitative methods for Human Health Risk Assessment and Ecological Risk Assessment. SCML is not aware of accepted quantitative risk assessment methods for Accidents and Malfunctions. Other than this point, SCML agrees with the recommendation. RECOMMENDATION Make the recommended changes, but using the phrase “Hazard identification and risk assessment”.	See updates to ToR section 6.1.2	SCML remains concerned about the expectations around quantitative risk assessment for accidents and malfunctions.
41	Gov of Canada: Sarah Robertson	GoC - PCA #11 Scope of Assessment - Key line of inquiry- Nahanni Caribou Herd Section 3.2.4	Comment There is potential for impacts on a number of caribou herds in the area of the project. As a result Parks Canada would like the Key line of inquiry to refer to just "caribou" and not specifically the Nahanni Caribou Herd. Recommendation Parks Canada	RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION The Finlayson herd is potentially affected by the proposed Selwyn mine in areas to the west of the mine, but its range is not along the HPAR and it is not potentially affected by the HPAR. The	The ToR requires an assessment of effects to the KLOI for "Caribou" and includes both the Nahanni and Redstone herds.	SCML agrees with the Board Staff Responses above (GNWT 16 & 21) in regards to the assessment of caribou. It is recommended that this be consistent with these responses (e.g. The KLOI includes effects to all caribou. The focus is

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			<p>recommends replacing "Nahanni caribou Herd" with just "Caribou" for the Key line of inquiry</p>	<p>Redstone herd is well to the north and is not potentially affected. There is no evidence that these herds overlap with the study area.</p> <p>The management unit used by responsible jurisdictions for woodland caribou is the 'herd' with a designated range based on telemetry studies and local knowledge. In this way management, applications (ie. sustainable harvest rates, etc.) are not compounded over other populations that may have differing population characteristics. To lump them as the species – 'caribou' - or the north American larger designation – 'woodland caribou ecotype' seems simplistic and a large departure from the convention of the herd designation commonly used. DNA studies in YT and NWT have found that the herds are relatively genetically distinct and conform well to the herd designation made by ecological observations.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Maintain the focus on the Nahanni Caribou Herd for the</p>		<p>maintained on the Nahanni Caribou Herd).</p>

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
				Key line of inquiry (do not replace this with "caribou")		
52	Gov of Canada: Sarah Robertson	GoC - PCA #22 Description of Environment - Section 4.0	<p>Comment The first sentence of this section indicates "SCML will provide a description of existing conditions in sufficient detail to enable an understanding of how the valued components might be affected by the proposed development." It is not clear what the term "existing" refers to, does it mean baseline data that has already been collected or data that captures current baseline? Parks Canada would like to ensure that additional work can be conducted if needed in defining the baseline.</p> <p>Recommendation Parks Canada recommends changing the word "existing" to "baseline" in this first sentence to ensure that additional work can be conducted in collecting baseline information if necessary.</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION The term "existing" was used because the road is in existence and in use. The conditions along the road reflect this and do not represent a pristine, static baseline condition. This does not preclude additional information being collected.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION No change recommended based on this comment.</p>	Please see clarification in Section 5 of the ToR.	SCML understands the differences between historic and current baseline studies, but notes that there are data limitations to establishing the cumulative baseline. There is limited baseline information that pre-dates economic development activity in the area (including original HPAR road construction in the 1970's). The cumulative baseline information can potentially be augmented with traditional and local knowledge and through comparison with undisturbed areas.
61	Gov of Canada: Sarah Robertson	GoC - PCA #31 Assessment of Environmental Impacts and Cumulative Effects - Nahanni Caribou Herd Section 7.1.1	<p>Comment There is potential for impacts on a number of caribou herds in the area of the project. As a result Parks Canada would like the Key line of inquiry to refer to just "caribou" and not specifically the Nahanni Caribou Herd.</p> <p>Recommendation Parks Canada recommends replacing "Nahanni</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION The Finlayson herd is potentially affected by the proposed Selwyn mine in areas to the west of the mine, but its range is not along the HPAR and it is not potentially affected by the HPAR. The Redstone herd is well to the</p>	The ToR requires an assessment of effects to the KLOI for "Caribou" and includes both the Nahanni and Redstone herds.	SCML agrees with the Board Staff Responses above (GNWT 16 & 21) in regards to the assessment of caribou. It is recommended that this be consistent with these responses (e.g. The KLOI includes effects to all caribou. The focus is maintained on the Nahanni

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			caribou Herd" with just "Caribou" for the Key line of inquiry.	north and is not potentially affected. There is no evidence that these herds overlap with the study area. RECOMMENDATION Maintain the focus on the Nahanni Caribou Herd for the Key line of inquiry (do not replace this with "caribou")		Caribou Herd).
66	Gov of Canada: Sarah Robertson	GoC - PCA #36 Assessment of Environmental Impacts and Cumulative Effects - Accidents and Malfunctions Section 7.1.2	Comment The term "risk assessment" is included as a stand alone bullet in section 7.1.2.1 Recommendation Parks Canada recommends providing some specifics related to "risk assessment" such as the wording found in the Canadian Zinc terms of reference: a risk assessment using best practices for the project including components, systems, hazards, and failure modes. assessment of the likelihood and severity of each risk identified.	SCML agrees with the reviewer's comment.	Please see updated text in section 6.1.2.1 of ToR	SCML remains concerned about the expectations around quantitative risk assessment for accidents and malfunctions (point 3 in 6.1.2.1). SCML recommends removing this point – the probability of accidents and malfunctions is covered in point 4 (as "likelihood") in wording consistent with the reviewer's recommendation.
11	Naha Dehe Dene Band: Christine Wenman	Valued components - Potentially affected communities - pg 16 of the draft Terms of Reference	Comment Currently, a very broad range of topics are clustered within the valued component - "potentially affected communities" NDDDB recommends that in order to ensure that this topic is covered in adequate detail, this valued component be broken down into additional discrete categories. This will	RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION SCML considers the benefits and effects of the project on communities as a Key line of inquiry. This will ensure that a comprehensive analysis is undertaken. SCML intends to complete the analysis of the effects of the project on	Updated TOR has an increased focus on identifying the existing economic and community wellness, and investigating project effects on these topics. Sees section 5.2.1 and 6.1.4. The Review Board agrees that community confidence and influence over the project are	The Board has increased the scope of the assessment that will be required in the DAR. While we understand the comment, SCML is concerned about the level of expectation and the appropriate alignment of assessment scope given this is a road upgrade project.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			<p>provide an opportunity for subjects to consider to be applied to each individual category and will help to ensure that the environmental assessment provides an adequate review of each topic including a detailed evaluation of adequate responses.</p> <p>Recommendation The valued component "potentially affected communities" should be listed as five separate valued components. These should include:</p> <p>1)Potentially affected communities - economic benefit and well-being 2) Potentially affected communities - distribution of benefits 3) Potential affected communities - training and skill development 4) Potential affected communities - community wellness and 5) Potential affected communities - community confidence and influence over project</p>	<p>employment and contracting opportunities; wage and salary income; training and skills development; business opportunities and overall community well-being as separate and distinct evaluations as described in Section 7.13 of the Developer’s Proposed Terms of Reference. This scope addresses the issues 1, 3 and 4 identified by the reviewer.</p> <p>The Cooperation Agreements between SCML and potentially affected communities cover issue 2, distribution of benefits, and this subject should be looked at through the agreements so that confidentiality is respected. Regarding reviewer’s issue 5, SCML does not consider “Community confidence and influence over the project” as a VC. These issues are best addressed through provisions in the Cooperation Agreements and any further SCML-Community Agreements developed as part of the Project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION The identification of separate VCs as recommended is not</p>	<p>not items for the TOR. If communities are not satisfied with the DAR and their engagement in SCML's project planning, they will have an opportunity to express that later in the EA process.</p>	

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
				considered necessary.		
13	Naha Dehe Dene Band: Christine Wenman	Valued components - Potentially affected communities - pg 16 of the draft Terms of Reference	<p>Comment Distribution of benefits is an important component of community well-being not yet specifically identified within the draft Terms of Reference document. Experiences elsewhere have demonstrated that benefits to mining operations are not always distributed equitably within a community and particular attention may be required to work with more vulnerable populations to assess how community well-being can be broadly considered within a project. NDDDB recommends that a socio-cultural and economic study be prepared as part of the environmental assessment project that includes primary, community-based research to facilitate such dialogues.</p> <p>Recommendation NDDDB recommends that subjects to consider for potentially affected communities - distribution of benefits - include how vulnerable groups within communities may be affected (including exclusion from benefits); further investigation into best practice elsewhere; and primary community based research</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION SCML acknowledges the reviewer's comments and understand the issues that they are addressing. The experiences of First Nations and best industry practices regarding socio-economic impact management are not issues to be addressed in a Terms of Reference. Rather, they will be considered in the design of SCML's socio-economic initiatives. The Cooperation Agreements between SCML and potentially affected communities and any further SCML-Community Agreements to be developed as part of the Project are the mechanisms by which the reviewer's issues are being addressed by SCML.</p> <p>SCML notes that it has formal Cooperation Agreements with both Sahtu and Dehcho communities that cover the life of the Project. These communities have been involved in the HPAR project in every step along the way and will continue to be involved.</p>	The updated TOR includes a more detailed analysis of vulnerable groups in communities, including those unlikely to benefit from the project. See sections 5.2.1.2 (3), 5.2.1.5 (4) and 6.1.4.2 (4) and 6.1.4.6 (2).	The Board has increased the scope of the assessment that will be required in the DAR. While we understand the comment, SCML is concerned about the level of expectation and the appropriate alignment of assessment scope given this is a road upgrade project.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			specifically targeting vulnerable groups including women.	RECOMMENDATION: No change recommended based on this comment.		
17	Naha Dehe Dene Band: Christine Wenman	Key lines of inquiry, pg. 17	<p>Comment NDDDB is generally supportive of the key lines of inquiry proposed by the project proponent and notes that the proponent had consulted with NDDDB prior to drafting the Terms of Reference. Overall, NDDDB recognizes their concerns reflected in the draft document. However, we have some recommendations to ensure that the key lines of inquiry fully capture the concerns NDDDB had expressed. For the first Key line of inquiry - Nahanni Caribou Herd, NDDDB agrees that the herd is the primary one likely to be effected. However, it should also be acknowledged and emphasized within the draft terms of reference that the herds are not discrete entities but rather their occasional interaction with other herds ensures their genetic diversity and population resilience.</p> <p>Recommendation NDDDB recommends that the proposed Key line of inquiry - Nahanni Caribou Herd include "effects on interactions with other herds"</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>SCML plans to focus of the Key line of inquiry on the Nahanni Caribou Herd and on measures that can be taken to minimize impacts. Caribou populations experience recurrent fluctuations over years. Their numbers go up and down naturally. During high densities, there may be some interchange of animals between herds – likely young males. However, DNA studies in Yukon and NWT have found that the herds are relatively genetically distinct and conform well to the herd designation made by ecological observations. A perfect management model would allow for long-term recurrent fluctuation such that human activity does not cause extreme low numbers nor prevent population highs so that herds can evolve as they should. SCML therefore recognizes the role interaction with other herds may play in long-term caribou population dynamics, but also believes that addressing this</p>	<p>The Review Board recognizes the value of caribou to the people of the Northwest Territories, and is aware of the stresses and cumulative effects affecting many of these herds. The TOR will summarize the potential for "effects on interactions with other herds" in its analysis. See section 6.1.1.2 (3) As the TOR outlines, SCML's investigation of wildlife effects must consider both scientific and Traditional Knowledge evidence.</p>	<p>SCML remains concerned about the expectations around this topic.</p> <p>As noted previously, SCML recognizes the role interaction with other herds may play in long-term caribou population dynamics, but also believes that addressing this topic in any practical, useful way is beyond the temporal and geographic scope of this project. The topic will be discussed in terms of potential for long-term effects, based on best available knowledge of the caribou in the region and on relevant results from research on this topic.</p>

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
				<p>topic in any practical, useful way is beyond the temporal and geographic scope of this project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION Do not add “effects on interactions with other herds” to the Key line of inquiry.</p>		
18	Naha Dehe Dene Band: Christine Wenman	Key lines of inquiry, pg. 17	<p>Comment NDDB appreciates that benefits and effects on communities is a Key line of inquiry. In order to ensure that all relevant topics are covered, the separate valued components previously discussed should be described in detail within the assessment.</p> <p>Recommendation NDDB recommends that the Key line of inquiry - benefits and effects on communities - include those recommendations for valued components previously described recommended within potentially affected communities.</p>	<p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION SCML acknowledges the reviewer’s comments and understand the issues that they are addressing. The number and organization of VCs to be addressed in the DAR does not limit the assessment in terms of scope nor level of detail. As noted previously, many of the issues raised by reviewers are regarding best industry practices and socio-economic impact management that are not issues to be addressed in a Terms of Reference as VCs.</p> <p>As described in Section 7.13 of the Developer’s Proposed Terms of Reference, SCML intends to describe current or proposed socio-economic initiatives or agreements aimed at maximizing potential benefits, such as measures, plans and commitments for maximizing</p>	The Review Board has included community wellbeing considerations as a Key Line of Inquiry in the TOR. See sections 5.2.1.1 and 6.1.4.2.	Section 6.1.4.2 does not exist in the current TOR. Please clarify.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
				<p>local and Aboriginal employment, contracting and business activity, including any proposed training, skills development or procurement policies and programs.</p> <p>The Cooperation Agreements between SCML and potentially affected communities and any further SCML-Community Agreements to be developed as part of the Project are the mechanisms by which the reviewer's issues are being addressed by SCML.</p> <p>SCML notes that it has formal Cooperation Agreements with both Sahtu and Dehcho communities that cover the life of the Project. These communities have been involved in the HPAR project in every step along the way and will continue to be involved.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION The identification of separate VCs as recommended is not considered necessary.</p>		
33	Naha Dehe Dene Band: Christine Wenman	7.1.1 Nahanni Caribou Herd	Comment Within 7.1.1.2 Direct and indirect alteration of habitat, including disturbance, the Proponent proposes to examine	As the reviewer noted, this comment/recommendation was also provided page 17, Key lines of inquiry – the rationale for the	The Review Board recognizes the value of caribou to the people of the Northwest Territories, and is aware of	SCML remains concerned about the expectations around this topic.

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
			<p>effects of the HPAR on caribou movement and patterns. As previously mentioned, effects on interaction with other caribou herds will need to be considered.</p> <p>Recommendation Recommend that effects on the Nahanni Herd's interaction with other herds be specifically examined.</p>	<p>recommendation is repeated here.</p> <p>RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>SCML plans to focus of the Key line of inquiry on the Nahanni Caribou Herd and on measures that can be taken to minimize impacts. Caribou populations experience recurrent fluctuations over years. Their numbers go up and down naturally. During high densities, there may be some interchange of animals between herds – likely young males. However, DNA studies in Yukon and NWT have found that the herds are relatively genetically distinct and conform well to the herd designation made by ecological observations. A perfect management model would allow for long-term recurrent fluctuation such that human activity does not cause extreme low numbers nor prevent population highs so that herds can evolve as they should. SCML therefore recognizes the role interaction with other herds may play in long-term caribou population dynamics, but also believes that addressing this</p>	<p>the stresses and cumulative effects affecting many of these herds. The TOR will summarize the potential for "effects on interactions with other herds" in its analysis. As the TOR outlines, SCML's investigation of wildlife effects must consider both scientific and Traditional Knowledge evidence.</p>	<p>As noted previously, SCML recognizes the role interaction with other herds may play in long-term caribou population dynamics, but also believes that addressing this topic in any practical, useful way is beyond the temporal and geographic scope of this project. The topic will be discussed in terms of potential for long-term effects, based on best available knowledge of the caribou in the region and on relevant results from research on this topic.</p>

ID	Reviewer	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Board Staff Response	SCML RESPONSE TO BOARD
				<p>topic in any practical, useful way is beyond the temporal and geographic scope of this project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION No changes are recommended based on this comment.</p>		