



Prince Rupert
Gas Transmission Project

Aboriginal Consultation Report #1

PRGT004776-TC-PR-RP-0045

January, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Project Background.....	1
1.2	Purpose of the Consultation Report	1
2.0	ABORIGINAL GROUPS IDENTIFIED FOR CONSULTATION	3
3.0	ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION OBJECTIVES	7
4.0	SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES WITH NISGA’A NATION	9
4.1	Working Groups.....	9
4.2	Information Exchange.....	9
4.2.1	General Project Information	9
4.2.2	Fieldwork and Permitting	10
4.3	NLG Permitting With Respect To Nisga’a Lands	11
4.4	Routing.....	12
4.5	Environmental Interests	14
4.6	Draft Application Information Requirements	15
4.7	Aboriginal Consultation Report.....	15
4.8	Capacity Funding	15
4.9	Nisga’a Knowledge.....	15
4.10	Economic, Social and Cultural Interests.....	15
4.11	Fieldwork Participation.....	16
5.0	SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS ON NISGA’A NATION TREATY INTERESTS	17
6.0	NISGA’A NATION CONSULTATION NEXT STEPS	23
7.0	SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES WITH SCHEDULE B ABORIGINAL GROUPS	25
7.1	Gitanyow.....	25
7.1.1	Information Exchange.....	25
7.1.2	Routing.....	26
7.1.3	Capacity Funding	27
7.1.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	27
7.1.5	Socio-economic.....	28
7.1.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	28
7.1.7	Employment and Business Opportunities	28
7.1.8	Next Steps	28
7.2	Gitxaala Nation	29
7.2.1	Information Exchange.....	29

	7.2.2	Routing.....	29
	7.2.3	Capacity Funding.....	30
	7.2.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	30
	7.2.5	Socio-economic.....	30
	7.2.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	31
	7.2.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	31
	7.2.8	Next Steps	31
7.3		Gitksan Nation	31
	7.3.1	Information Exchange.....	31
	7.3.2	Routing.....	32
	7.3.3	Capacity Funding.....	33
	7.3.4	Traditional Land Use and Ecological Knowledge	33
	7.3.5	Socio-economic.....	33
	7.3.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	33
	7.3.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	34
	7.3.8	Next Steps	34
7.4		Halfway River First Nation.....	34
	7.4.1	Information Exchange.....	34
	7.4.2	Routing.....	35
	7.4.3	Capacity funding.....	35
	7.4.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	35
	7.4.5	Socio-economic.....	36
	7.4.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	36
	7.4.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	36
	7.4.8	Next Steps	36
7.5		Kitselas First Nation	36
	7.5.1	Information Exchange.....	37
	7.5.2	Routing.....	38
	7.5.3	Capacity Funding.....	38
	7.5.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	38
	7.5.5	Socio-economic.....	38
	7.5.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	38
	7.5.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	39
	7.5.8	Next Steps	39
7.6		Kitsumkalum First Nation.....	39
	7.6.1	Information Exchange.....	39
	7.6.2	Routing.....	40
	7.6.3	Capacity funding.....	41
	7.6.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	41
	7.6.5	Socio-economic.....	41

7.6.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	41
7.6.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	41
7.6.8	Next Steps.....	42
7.7	Lake Babine Nation	42
7.7.1	Information Exchange.....	42
7.7.2	Routing.....	43
7.7.3	Capacity Funding.....	43
7.7.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	43
7.7.5	Socio-economic.....	43
7.7.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	44
7.7.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	44
7.7.8	Next Steps.....	44
7.8	Lax Kw'alaams Band.....	44
7.8.1	Information Exchange.....	45
7.8.2	Routing.....	46
7.8.3	Capacity Funding.....	46
7.8.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	47
7.8.5	Socio-economic.....	47
7.8.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	47
7.8.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	47
7.8.8	Next Steps.....	47
7.9	McLeod Lake Indian Band	48
7.9.1	Information Exchange.....	48
7.9.2	Routing.....	48
7.9.3	Capacity funding.....	49
7.9.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	49
7.9.5	Socio-economic.....	49
7.9.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	49
7.9.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	49
7.9.8	Next Steps.....	49
7.10	Metlakatla First Nation	50
7.10.1	Information exchange	50
7.10.2	Routing.....	52
7.10.3	Capacity funding.....	52
7.10.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	52
7.10.5	Socio-economic.....	53
7.10.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	53
7.10.7	Employment and Business Opportunities.....	53
7.10.8	Next Steps.....	53
7.11	Nak'azdli Band	54

7.11.1	Information Exchange.....	54
7.11.2	Routing.....	54
7.11.3	Capacity funding.....	55
7.11.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	55
7.11.5	Socio-economic.....	56
7.11.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	56
7.11.7	Employment and Business Opportunities	56
7.11.8	Next Steps	56
7.12	Saulteau First Nations	56
7.12.1	Information Exchange.....	57
7.12.2	Routing.....	57
7.12.3	Capacity funding.....	58
7.12.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	58
7.12.5	Socio-economic.....	58
7.12.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	58
7.12.7	Employment and Business Opportunities	58
7.12.8	Next Steps	59
7.13	Takla Lake First Nation	59
7.13.1	Information exchange	59
7.13.2	Routing.....	60
7.13.3	Capacity Funding	60
7.13.4	Traditional Land use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	60
7.13.5	Socio-economic.....	61
7.13.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	61
7.13.7	Employment/Business Opportunities.....	61
7.13.8	Next Steps	61
7.14	Tl'azt'en Nation	61
7.14.1	Information Exchange.....	61
7.14.2	Routing.....	63
7.14.3	Capacity funding.....	63
7.14.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	63
7.14.5	Socio-economic.....	63
7.14.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	64
7.14.7	Employment/Business Opportunities.....	64
7.14.8	Next Steps	64
7.15	West Moberly First Nations.....	64
7.15.1	Information Exchange.....	64
7.15.2	Routing.....	65
7.15.3	Capacity Funding	66

7.15.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	66
7.15.5	Socio-economic.....	66
7.15.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	66
7.15.7	Employment and Business Opportunities	66
7.15.8	Next Steps	66
7.16	Yekooche First Nation	67
7.16.1	Information Exchange.....	67
7.16.2	Routing.....	68
7.16.3	Capacity Funding	68
7.16.4	Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge	68
7.16.5	Socio-economic.....	68
7.16.6	Fieldwork Participation.....	68
7.16.7	Employment and Business Opportunities	69
7.16.8	Next Steps	69
8.0	SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES WITH SCHEDULE C ABORIGINAL GROUPS AND MÉTIS	71
8.1	Blueberry River First Nations.....	71
8.2	Carrier Sekani Tribal Council.....	71
8.3	Doig River First Nation	71
8.4	Fort Nelson First Nation	72
8.5	Métis	72
8.6	Office of the Wet’suwet’en.....	72
8.7	Prophet River First Nation	72
8.8	Treaty 8 Tribal Association	73
8.9	Tsay Keh Dene First Nation	73
9.0	SUMMARY OF ABORIGINAL INTERESTS AND CONCERNS	75
10.0	NEXT STEPS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	82
11.0	GLOSSARY.....	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5-1: Potential Effects on Nisga'a Nation Treaty Interests 18
Table 9-1: Aboriginal Interests and Concerns 75

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Ltd. (PRGT), a wholly owned subsidiary of TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TransCanada), is proposing to construct and operate a natural gas pipeline starting at a point near Hudson's Hope, BC and extending to the proposed Pacific Northwest LNG export facility near Prince Rupert, at Lelu Island, within the District of Port Edward, BC.

The proposed Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Project (the proposed Project) involves:

- The construction and operation of a pipeline of up to 900 km in length with a diameter of up to 48 inches (1,219 mm).
- The construction and operation of permanent pipeline components and activities, including metering facilities, up to nine compressor stations, mainline valves, power supply, communications links, and inspection and maintenance facilities.
- Temporary and permanent infrastructure and activities, including access roads, bridges, stockpile sites, borrow sites, contractor yards and construction camps.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION REPORT

Pursuant to the Section 11 Order (the Order), PRGT is required to submit to the EAO three Aboriginal Consultation Reports. This is the first of those reports. It summarizes consultation activities done by PRGT up to October 23, 2013.

As directed in Section 18.2 of the Order, a draft of this Aboriginal Consultation Report (the Report) was shared with the Aboriginal groups on Schedule B of the Order for review and comment. The draft Report was sent on November 7 and 8, 2013. Comments received have been considered and incorporated, as appropriate, in the Report.

Pursuant to Section 18.1 of the Order, the Report is intended to:

- Summarize the efforts undertaken by PRGT to consult with Aboriginal groups on Schedule B in accordance with the approved Aboriginal Consultation Plan (the Plan), and to summarize the efforts undertaken by PRGT to consult with any other Aboriginal groups, if directed to do so by the Project Assessment Lead.
- Identify feedback and information received during consultation.
- Identify potential adverse impacts of the proposed Project on Aboriginal Interests.
- Identify how the potential adverse impacts of the proposed Project on Aboriginal Interests will be mitigated or otherwise addressed.

- Outline next steps or future consultation activities, other than those outlined in the approved Plan.

The Report will help ensure that PRGT and the EAO meaningfully engage Aboriginal groups to gain an understanding of their Aboriginal Interests, understand how the proposed Project may affect those Aboriginal Interests, and identify proposed measures to avoid or mitigate these potential effects.

2.0 ABORIGINAL GROUPS IDENTIFIED FOR CONSULTATION

On November 8, 2013 the EAO issued the Order for the proposed Project. The Order identified on Schedule B the Aboriginal groups to be consulted by PRGT for the proposed Project. The Aboriginal groups identified on Schedule B of the Order are:

Nisga'a Nation:

- Nisga'a Lisims Government

Treaty 8:

- Halfway River First Nation
- McLeod Lake Indian Band
- Saulteau First Nations
- West Moberly First Nations

First Nations:

- Lake Babine First Nation
- Nak'azdli Band
- Takla Lake First Nation
- Tl'azt'en Nation
- Gitxsan
 - Delgamuukw
 - Geel
 - Gitludahl
 - Guutkunuxw
 - Gwii Yeehl
 - Gyetm Galdoo
 - Kliiyeem Lax Ha
 - Luutkudziiwus
 - Mauus
 - Wii Eelast
 - Wii Mugulxw
 - Wosimlaxha
 - Yagosip
- Gitanyow

- Wilp Gamlakyeltxw
- Wilp Malii
- Wilp Gwaas Hla'am
- Wilp Watakhayetsxw
- Wilp Luux Hon
- Lax kw'alaams Nation
- Metlakatla First Nation
- Gitxaala Nation
- Yekooche First Nation
- Kitselas First Nation
- Kitsumkalum First Nation

The Order identified in Schedule C additional Aboriginal groups to be provided with notification and consulted with by PRGT, as required by the EAO Project Assessment Lead. The Aboriginal groups identified on Schedule C of the Order are:

Treaty 8:

- Blueberry River First Nations
- Doig River First Nation
- Fort Nelson First Nation
- Prophet River First Nation
- Treaty 8 Tribal Association

First Nations:

- Carrier Sekani Tribal Council
- Office of the Wet'suwet'en
- Tsay Keh Dene First Nation
- Gitxsan
 - Antguulilbisxw
 - Gaxsbgaba
 - Gwis Gyen
 - Hanamux
 - Kyooluugyat
 - Luus

- Miluulak
- Nii Kyap
- Nikateen
- Sakum Higookxw
- Spookw
- Ts'ogashlee
- Wii Gyet
- Wiigyat
- xGwoimtxw

Although not identified in the Order, as per the Plan, PRGT has provided information and undertaken engagement activities with the following Métis organizations:

- Métis Nation British Columbia
- Kelly Lake Métis Settlement Society

3.0 ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION OBJECTIVES

PRGT will consult Aboriginal groups in accordance with the Order and guided by the approved Plan. TransCanada's Aboriginal engagement principles, policies and programs have, and will continue to, also guide Aboriginal consultation for the proposed Project. The goals of PRGT's consultation program are to:

- Build and maintain positive long-term relationships with Aboriginal groups potentially affected by the proposed Project.
- Identify consultation protocols and practices that are acceptable to Aboriginal groups.
- Prepare and present timely, honest and accurate information to allow for informed, effective and meaningful engagement with Aboriginal groups.
- Support the participation of Aboriginal groups in regulatory processes, with a focus on the environmental assessment (EA) process through, for example, capacity funding and information sharing.
- Ensure that Aboriginal groups' input and concerns are gathered, understood and integrated into proposed Project design, the EA process, and monitoring programs related to the construction and operation of the pipeline.
- Ensure that concerns and issues with respect to potential effects related to Aboriginal Interests are identified and addressed in the EA process.
- Clearly document consultation activities with Aboriginal groups to demonstrate how their participation has influenced the EA process and proposed Project planning.

On June 12, 2013, a draft of the Plan was shared with all of the potentially affected Aboriginal groups identified. PRGT reviewed, considered and incorporated, as appropriate, comments received from Aboriginal groups and submitted the revised Plan to the EAO on November 25, 2013.

4.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES WITH NISGA'A NATION

4.1 WORKING GROUPS

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Nisga'a Nation, through the Nisga'a Lisims Government (NLG), in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. As agreed to by NLG, PRGT is also consulting with the Nisga'a Village Governments of Laxgalts'ap, Gingolx, Gitwinksihlkw, and Gitlaxt'aamiks in respect of possible use of Nisga'a Village Lands.

In furtherance of meeting the requirements of Chapter 10 of the Nisga'a Final Agreement, and to facilitate meaningful consultation and engagement with the Nisga'a Nation, PRGT and NLG have established the following working groups:

- The EA Advisory Group, which is composed of representatives from: PRGT Aboriginal Relations and Environment/Regulatory, PRGT Legal Counsel; Stantec Environmental and Social Discipline Leads and Advisors; and, representatives from NLG Lands Office, NLG Legal Counsel, and NLG technical advisors from LGL Ltd. The EA Advisory Group meets regularly to review issues pertaining to the EA and share information to ensure the EA fulfills the requirements of the Nisga'a Final Agreement (NFA).
- The Nisga'a-PRGT Route Selection Working Group was established in July 2013 and is comprised of senior representatives, technical consultants and legal counsel from NLG, as well as senior representatives, technical consultants and legal counsel for PRGT. See section 4.5 for further details.

4.2 INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Since PRGT began consultation in January 2013, it has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Nisga'a Nation.

General Project Information

- PRGT and NLG representatives had an introductory meeting to introduce the respective parties and present an overview of the proposed Project on January 16, 2013.
- PRGT met with NLG, Nisga'a Commercial Group of Companies (NCG) and Village Government representatives (Gitlaxt'aamiks, Gitwinksihlkw, and Laxgalts'ap) regarding a communication protocol, the NFA, and the proposed Project overview on May 13, 2013.
- PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to an individual folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

- PRGT provided regular Project activity updates via email on a monthly basis commencing in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.
- PRGT presented to the NLG Legislative assembly (July 30, 2013)
- Nisga'a Community Open Houses in each Nisga'a Village to discuss the proposed Project.
 - Gitwinksihlkw Village (September 9, 2013)
 - Gitlaxt'aamiks Village (September 11, 2013)
 - Laxgalts'ap Village (September 12, 2013)
 - Gingolx Village (September 24, 2013)

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged with NLG with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

- PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure, which included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply under the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment (May 8, May 21, 2013).
- On May 31, 2013, PRGT and NLG discussed the proposed environmental baseline studies. NLG provided feedback on perceived gaps in the baseline studies and shared a list of relevant references with PRGT and its consultants. In addition, NLG identified some of the following concerns with respect to the baseline program:
 - NLG identified a concern about PRGT duplicating efforts in data collection for EA-related studies and recommended that PRGT use existing studies, including those done for NLG.
 - NLG requested that all study work plans conducted in Nisga'a Lands be applied to the Nass Area.
 - NLG identified a concern with the scope and methodology of terrestrial and marine studies. PRGT shared methodology of those studies and discussions regarding those studies are ongoing.
 - NLG requested adjustment to scope and methodology of amphibian surveys for tailed frogs. PRGT shared methodology of those studies and the studies were amended as appropriate.
- PRGT provided a geotechnical investigative program summary and cover letter on May 14, 2013, posted maps and a sketch plan on Sharepoint and sent hard copies by mail.

- PRGT notified NLG of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on May 21, 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications.
 - PRGT offered to discuss the application with NLG and to organize a site-visit prior to geotechnical work being conducted (June 18 – July 9, 2013).
 - PRGT provided additional Crown land application notifications in September 2013.
- Starting July 15th, 2013 PRGT provided weekly field program summaries to NLG on upcoming fieldwork across the biophysical field studies including, wildlife, vegetation, archaeology, TEM, soils/terrain, fisheries, marine, air quality and aesthetics (with the exception of July 29, October 7 and November 18, 2013). PRGT intends to provide to NLG the data and reports collected through the field programs as they become available.

4.3 NLG PERMITTING IN RESPECT OF NISGA'A LANDS

- An application for a Special Use Permit (SUP) was made to NLG to permit biophysical studies within Nisga'a Lands. The SUP was issued June 19, 2013. Several subsequent amendments (July 8, July 30, and September 5, 2013) were approved by NLG to permit additional studies on Nisga'a Lands.
- In August 2013, PRGT submitted helicopter pad locations and sketch plans as well as timber type information to support PRGT's second SUP application to permit new helicopter sites to be cleared on Nisga'a Lands.
 - NLG identified a concern about SUP brush clearing for stream crossing center-lines and requested it be limited to 2m wide and no merchantable trees felled. PRGT agreed to stipulations in SUP.
- Over July and August 2013, PRGT provided NLG with the requisite information to support a License of Occupation (LOO) application to conduct geotechnical investigations on Nisga'a Lands. NLG provided PRGT with a draft document in August 2013 and upon further review by both parties, NLG issued PRGT an LOO on September 13, 2013.
 - NLG identified a concern regarding merchantable timber and requested that Nisga'a Utilization Standards apply to Projects on Nisga'a lands. PRGT accepted Nisga'a utilization standards for merchantable timber cutting in all plans (SUP, LOO).
 - NLG identified a concern regarding danger trees and included the requirement for a Danger Tree Assessment prior to cutting trees in the SUP and LOO.

4.4 ROUTING

Consultation with NLG and PRGT regarding routing has included:

- Representatives of PRGT and NLG met (April 4, 2013) to discuss the proposed Project and provide route maps, which included original desktop planned routes through Nisga'a Lands to the north and south of the Nisga'a Memorial Lava Bed Park (the Park) (but not through the Park).
- PRGT, Focus (route survey contractor) and Stantec (environmental assessment contractor) staff met with NLG and Village Government representatives from Laxgalts'ap, Gitwinksihlkw, and Gitlaxt'aamiks (May 14, 2013). Original desktop route options north and south of the Park were reviewed and Nisga'a representatives outlined a number of concerns that would need to be addressed by PRGT including potential impacts to mushroom grounds, village sites, visual quality objectives, and hot spring sites.
- Representatives of PRGT and NLG met on July 10, 2013 to discuss next steps for Project engagement. NLG recommended that the Route Selection Working Group meeting scheduled for July 18, 2013 focus on detailed discussion of possible routes that would result in fewer impacts on Nisga'a Interests under the NFA.
- The Route Selection Working Group met on July 18 and September 24, 2013 to discuss routing and conducted a helicopter flyover of the proposed routing options on October 16, 2013.

Through the above consultation the following issues and concerns have been identified:

- Avoidance of route options that involved crossing the Nass River.
- Potential impacts of the proposed Project to Pine mushroom harvesting and other high value areas.
- NLG representatives requested that PRGT consider a southerly route (which will likely involve going through the Park) that avoided crossing the Nass River twice and stayed to the south of Highway 113 (Nisga'a Highway) and indicated that this route may have fewer impacts than the PRGT route option to the north that would cross the Nass River twice.
- NLG stressed the importance of visual quality management and asked that, should PRGT investigate a route through the Park, PRGT consider another option for installing the pipe under Nisga'a Highway, which could possibly minimize visual impacts by avoiding a wider right-of-way disturbance required to install the pipeline adjacent to the Nisga'a Highway.
- NLG stressed the importance of spiritual areas.
- Potential impact of the proposed Project on wetlands and avoiding impacts to such areas.
- Potential impact of the proposed Project on salmon-bearing streams and avoiding such impacts.

- Potential impacts of the proposed Project on watersheds including, Gingit Creek, Zolzap watershed and Slough Area, Quilgauw Creek Area, Gingit Creek watershed and Seaskinnish Creek.
- Potential impact of the route crossing the Laxgalts'ap watershed and bisecting the bivalve harvesting area at Nasoga Gulf.
- Concern regarding the potential for sediment contamination in Alice Arm.
- Potential impacts to the Nisga'a spirit (Naxnok).
- Potential risks associated with the Nass River crossings
- Potential impacts to mushroom grounds.
- Potential impacts to the historic Nisga'a Village site.
- Potential impacts to wildlife.
- Potential impacts of a route through the Park given its cultural and spiritual values.
- Concern over pipeline stability and potential impacts to groundwater and fisheries in the Park.
- Pursuant to the NFA, NLG identified an interest in the Kwinamass Park and in being consulted on any proposed routes through the park. PRGT has abandoned the proposed route through the Kwinamass Park
- In response to concerns raised and feedback, PRGT has made a number of changes to its routing. Discussion is ongoing but below is a list of preliminary route changes that have been implemented:
 - A proposed route was moved from the north side of the Nass River to the south paralleling the existing highway, as concerns were expressed by NLG regarding the social, economic, cultural and environmental effects of this route.
 - NLG indicated that passing through the mushroom grounds would affect the local communities as many Nisga'a citizens harvest mushrooms both for sustenance and as a source of income.
 - NLG was also concerned with the proposed route crossing the Nass River twice as the Nass River is the primary source of water for the village of Gitwinksihlkw.
 - NLG expressed concerns with the original crossing on Kasi Ma'tin Creek due to the tendency of the creek channels to move around horizontally.
 - The PRGT proposed route was moved further upstream on the creek where it is confined by the valley slopes.
 - NLG expressed concerns regarding the proposed route option, which crossed the Laxgalts'ap watershed as well as the entry into Nass Bay. The entry into

Nass Bay consisted of shallow mud flats that NLG do not want disturbed due to prime fishing and harvesting areas.

- In response to these concerns, PRGT abandoned the route along the north side of the Nass River, which crossed the Laxgalts'ap watershed as the entry into Nass Bay.
- PRGT is exploring the Nasoga Gulf Route option in response to feedback provided by the NLG.
- PRGT has also indicated to Nisga'a citizens that studies and fieldwork are continuing in order to better understand the potential social, cultural, economic and environmental effects of each of the route options.
- Routing shapefiles were provided through an individual SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013. NLG has requested additional information with respect to proposed routing options including, but not limited to, any temporary use areas required for pipeline construction and maintenance (camps, laydown areas, access roads, etc.).
- PRGT is in the process of providing this information to the NLG.

4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL INTERESTS

Pursuant to the Order and the draft Application Information Requirements (dAIR), the Application must address potential effects of the proposed Project on a range of environmental Interests identified in the NFA, including Interests related to Nisga'a Lands, Nisga'a Fee Simple Lands, access to other lands, and the Nisga'a citizens' rights to harvest fish and aquatic plants, including marine mammals, wildlife and migratory birds. In addition, the dAIR specifies that the Application must assess potential effects on other Interests, including those related to mushrooms, edible plants and medicinal plants.

Stantec and PRGT have met, and continue to meet, with NLG and LGL representatives both through the EA Advisory group and directly on specific topics, to discuss technical issues related to the preparation of the Application and to clarify Interests identified in the NFA.

4.6 DRAFT APPLICATION INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

PRGT sent the dAIR to NLG on August 30, 2013. Based on prior work with EAO and on NLG comments on past dAIRs for other similar projects, EAO submitted to PRGT recommended revisions to the dAIR sections with an aim to better reflect NFA requirements. PRGT revised the dAIR to include NFA Chapter 10 Section 8(e) and 8(f) requirements. Additional comments from NLG are expected before the finalization of the dAIR so that the AIR for the proposed Project is consistent with other similar projects currently being assessed by the EAO.

4.7 ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION REPORT

The draft Report and a letter inviting comments on the draft Report was submitted to NLG on November 7, 2013 and feedback requested.

4.8 CAPACITY FUNDING

PRGT and NLG signed a Letter of Agreement (LOA) on July 25, 2013, which provided initial capacity funding for NLG's participation in the EA review of the proposed Project. PRGT received a work plan and budget proposal for a capacity funding Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in July 2013. Negotiations between NLG and PRGT are ongoing.

4.9 NISGA'A KNOWLEDGE

To date Nisga'a citizens have not participated in PRGT's Nisga'a knowledge gathering. NLG and PGRT are continuing to discuss the means by, and extent to which traditional knowledge will be incorporated into the effects assessment.

4.10 ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL INTERESTS

The dAIR specifies that the Application address potential effects of the proposed Project on economic, social and cultural Interests identified in Chapter 10 Paragraph 8(f) of the NFA.

Stantec facilitated focus group sessions in each Nisga'a Village during the month of October 2013. The purpose of the focus group sessions was to ask village residents what might be the potential economic, social and cultural effects of the proposed Project. The sessions were held in each village as follows:

- Focus Group Session on Potential Economic, Social and Cultural Effects of the proposed Project in Laxgalts'ap Village (October 16, 2013).
- Focus Group Session on Potential Economic, Social and Cultural Effects of the proposed Project in Gingolx Village (October 17, 2013).
- Focus Group Session on Potential Economic, Social and Cultural Effects of the proposed Project in Gitlaxt'aamiks Village (October 23, 2013).
- Focus Group Session on Potential Economic, Social and Cultural Effects of the proposed Project in Gitwinksihlkw Village (October 24, 2013).

In October 2013, Stantec also held a number of interviews with NLG representatives, including staff members of the Laxgalts'ap Village and Gingolx Council, and staff members of the Nisga'a Valley Health Authority and Nisga'a Commercial Group (NCG) to discuss the potential economic, social and cultural effects of the proposed Project. In November 2013, Stantec is proposing to engage with Nisga'a citizens

living outside of the Nass Valley, in Terrace, Vancouver and Prince Rupert, via an online survey upon approval from NLG.

PRGT is committed to hiring Nisga'a citizens for construction and operations work and is currently setting up its process. PRGT and NLG representatives are discussing possible employment and contracting opportunities in connection with initial field studies and the environmental assessment of the proposed Project. Meetings are scheduled for October 25 and November 14 to discuss further.

4.11 FIELD WORK PARTICIPATION

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors- Allnorth, Focus, and BGC engaged NCG regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with each of Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and Nisga'a members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

PRGT, through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, has also provided the Nisga'a Nation with the opportunity to participate in environmental fieldwork. A subcontractor agreement was established between Lisims Forest Resources Limited Partnership, by its general partner Nisga'a Fisheries Ltd. and Stantec. The contract was established to define the terms and conditions for the furnishing of professional services with respect to PRGT. Nisga'a citizens have been hired as assistants in Stantec's biophysical assessments, including positions as wildlife monitors and cultural monitors.

5.0 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS ON NISGA'A NATION TREATY INTERESTS

Through the course of consultation to date, NLG has identified to PRGT a number of concerns pertaining to their Treaty Interests. These Treaty Interests, along with a preliminary list of potential adverse effects and sample mitigation measures are summarized in Table 5-1. PRGT expects that its understanding of the potential adverse effects on Nisga'a Nation Treaty Interests will evolve over time, including as a direct result of greater certainty in respect of the proposed route and ongoing consultation with NLG. PRGT will also continue meeting with NLG to consider potential mitigation measures, as well as considering input from the Working Group, public feedback and further analysis by PRGT.

In January 2014, PRGT proposes to review the second Report with NLG, which will include a set of potential mitigation measures based on the feedback noted above.

Finally, in addition to on-going efforts by PRGT to meet with and respond to concerns, NLG will have multiple opportunities to review and comment on the predicted effects and proposed mitigation measures contained in the Application for an EAC during the 180-day Application review phase of the EA process which is anticipated to commence in April, 2014.

Table 5-1: Potential Effects on Nisga'a Nation Treaty Interests

Treaty Interests	Potential Adverse Effect	Potential Mitigation – Sample Measures
Environment	Potential effects of PRGT pipeline location and associated activities in proximity to alluvial fan and the parent materials of the fan (as pushed about by high flow events).	PRGT team adjusted work plans, rerouted the proposed Project, and work is now taking place south, upstream of alluvial fan.
Harvesting fish and aquatic plants	Potential effect of the proposed Project on fresh water and marine resources from construction activities,	<p>Scheduling of Project activities will be coordinated through consultation with local fish harvesters and other interest groups and best efforts will be made to schedule activities to minimize interference with fisheries, other activities and known biological events (e.g., salmon runs, oolichan spawning).</p> <p>PRGT will utilize best management practices to minimize impacts on vegetation, including limiting clearing at watercourse crossings to the removal of trees and shrubs to the ditch line and work side areas required for vehicle crossings; minimizing extra temporary workspace within the Riparian Management Area; and installing erosion and sediment control at all watercourses and water bodies.</p> <p>Clearly identify and restrict intertidal construction areas to limit trampling and crushing of species.</p> <p>Install erosion and sediment control at all watercourses, waterbodies and shorelines</p> <p>Water quality monitoring plans will be developed, as needed, to monitor for sediment events during in-stream construction activities as required by regulatory approvals</p> <p>If HDD is used for pipeline construction, minimize disturbance in the marine riparian, intertidal and sub tidal environment, as far as practicably feasible.</p> <p>Use of fill material for rock berms or pipe protection that is free of fines, debris and any substances that would be deleterious to the marine environment.</p> <p>Comply with all conditions of Fisheries Act authorizations</p> <p>Compensation programs will be designed in consultation with NLG.</p> <p>Return the watercourse bed and banks to their pre-disturbance configuration, with no re-alignment of the channel</p> <p>Implement stream bank reclamation measures to re-establish riparian vegetation and fish habitat</p>

Treaty Interests	Potential Adverse Effect	Potential Mitigation – Sample Measures
Harvesting fish and aquatic plants	Potential effect of the PRGT pipeline on the Laxgalts'ap watershed as well as the entry into Nass Bay. The entry into Nass Bay consists of shallow mud flats that NLG do not want disturbed due to prime fishing and harvesting areas.	PRGT abandoned the route option along the north side of the Nass River, which crossed the Laxgalts'ap watershed as entry into the Nass Bay. PRGT is currently evaluating multiple options for the marine route based on bathymetric surveys and field assessments. Recommendations of the Route Selection Working Group will be considered in this decision making process.
Harvesting wildlife	Potential effects of the proposed Project on increasing human access and associated impacts on moose and wildlife habitat.	<p>The proposed Project will utilize existing roads and linear corridors, where practical.</p> <p>The proposed Project should avoid the construction of circuit roads (dead-end roads are preferred) and reclaim temporary roads with vegetation</p> <p>Implement an Access Management, including access control measures (e.g., signage, road closures, restrictions, access control structures, vegetation screens) to reduce or prevent unauthorized motorized access, including ATV and snowmobiles.</p> <p>Prohibit Project personnel from hunting and carrying firearms in the Project area.</p> <p>Report unauthorized access activities to the Environmental Inspector(s). Specific protection measures may be implemented as required.</p>
Harvesting wildlife	Potential effect on the three key mammals that Nisga'a people include in the Nass Wildlife Management Plan, namely grizzly bear, moose and mountain goat.	<p>Routing of the Project has considered potential effects on grizzly bear, mountain goat and moose. Where information has been available (e.g., important grizzly bear habitat, designated or important areas for mountain goat), potential adverse effects have been minimized through routing of the pipeline, to the extent feasible based on routing discussions with Nisga'a.</p> <p>Pre-construction wildlife surveys will be completed to identify habitat features the warrant mitigation</p> <p>Schedule clearing and construction activities to avoid relevant ungulate winter ranges, in accordance with provincial timing constraints</p> <p>Implement mitigative measures for construction activities within provincial grizzly bear zones</p> <p>Where practical, maintain a minimum 50m setback distance from identified bear dens during winter construction</p> <p>Restore natural vegetation in accordance with the BC Oil and Gas Regulations. Use natural recovery as the preferred method of reclamation on level terrain and at wetlands</p>
Water	Potential effect of the PRGT pipeline route on the Nass River.	PRGT is working in consultation with NLG to define a route that avoids crossing the Nass River. PRGT's current proposed route is through the Park.

Treaty Interests	Potential Adverse Effect	Potential Mitigation – Sample Measures
Water	Potential effect of the PRGT pipeline Route on the Kasi Matin Creek due to the tendency of the creek channels to move around horizontally.	Route Selection Working Group identified a route upstream of the alluvial fan in an area where it is confined by the valley slopes. PRGT is implementing that route adjustment.
Visual effects	Potential visual impacts associated with proposed Project.	PRGT will develop, in consultation with NLG, mitigation plans to minimize visual impacts associated with the proposed project (e.g. replacement of lava boulders along the final right-of-way)
Socio-economic	Potential economic effects of the proposed Project	PRGT and NLG are having ongoing discussions regarding possible economic benefits and economic impacts of the proposed Project
Archaeology	Potential effect of the proposed Project on known archaeological sites.	<p>Complete an AIA study to locate and characterize cultural and heritage sites along the proposed right-of-way before any Project-related ground disturbing activities.</p> <p>Develop and implement a Heritage Resources Management Plan (HRMP) that outlines a process for the development of appropriate site-specific management procedures - with input from Archaeology Branch and NLG - considering site type, integrity, cultural value and scientific significance.</p> <p>In accordance with the HRMP (and consistent with the HCA which automatically protects archaeological sites), the preferred management option for identified sites will be avoidance through Project redesign and/or micro rerouting.</p> <p>Do not permit grading in proximity to known archaeological sites unless otherwise approved by the Archaeology Branch of BC MFLNRO.</p>
Cultural	Potential effects of the route option through the Park (visual impacts, splatter cones in the lava fields indicating high pressure and suggests tubes connect to lava bed; disturbance of lichen growing on lava beds; disturbance to cultural values).	PRGT will continue to work with NLG to develop specific mitigation measures for potential effects through the Park.
Cultural	Potential effects of the proposed route options on Nisga'a Grease Trail, Pine Mushrooms, Ecological reserves, parks, flood plains, and hot springs. Recommendation that the pipeline avoid these areas.	<p>Route Selection Working Group has been formed to review route options, discuss Nisga'a interests that may be affected by the various route options, and potential mitigations to address those impacts. Additionally, certain route changes have been made in response to concerns raised.</p> <p>Environmental, heritage, social and cultural effects are being studied in the EA. Route to be selected based on input from Nisga'a Nation and other Aboriginal groups, stakeholders, biophysical and engineering feasibility studies.</p>

Treaty Interests	Potential Adverse Effect	Potential Mitigation – Sample Measures
Cultural	Potential effects on the places where the Spirit lives.	Route Selection Working Group has been formed to review route options, discuss Nisga'a interests that may be affected by the various route options, and potential mitigations to address those impacts. Additionally, certain route changes have been made in response to concerns raised.
Social Effects	Potential social effects of the proposed Project	Pursuant to paragraph 8(f), Chapter 10 of the NFA, PRGT will conduct an existing and future economic, social and cultural well-being assessment of Nisga'a citizens. Please refer to section 4.10 for further information.
Gathering	Potential effects of route options on mushroom management area.	PRGT received Nisga'a Land Use Plan, which lays out management objectives and considerations for each of the LUP zones - including mushroom zones. In response to concerns expressed by NLG about mushroom management areas to the north of the Nass River, PRGT has identified an alternate route through the Lava Bed that would avoid these important areas.

6.0 NISGA'A NATION CONSULTATION NEXT STEPS

PRGT will continue its consultation activities with the Nisga'a Nation, which will include ongoing dialogue and information exchange. Next steps include:

- Nisga'a Open Houses for Nisga'a citizens residing outside of the Nass area:
 - November 7, 2013 Prince Rupert
 - November 13, 2013 Terrace
 - November 23, 2013 Vancouver
- Meeting with NLG in November to review summary of potential Project effects on Nisga'a Interests and proposed mitigation measures.
- EA Advisory Group meetings scheduled for November 22, December 6 and December 17, 2013.
- Meeting scheduled for November 14, 2013 to discuss employment and contracting.
- Where possible, continue to employ Nisga'a citizens on project related activities.
- Community Open Houses to be held in Laxgalts'ap, Gingolx, Gitwinksihlkw, and Gitlaxt'aamiks in spring 2014.
- The Route Selection Working Group will continue to meet to ensure refinements to the route are made to address NLG and Project engineering concerns.

Continued engagement is planned with NLG through specific Project consultation meetings and with Nisga'a citizens through Open Houses.

7.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES WITH SCHEDULE B ABORIGINAL GROUPS

7.1 GITANYOW

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Gitanyow Huwlip Society / Gitanyow Hereditary Chiefs (Gitanyow) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Gitanyow.

7.1.1 Information Exchange

Gitanyow advised PRGT that it did not represent Wilp Luux Hon (Luux Hon) and that all consultation activities with Luux Hon must occur directly with Luux Hon representatives. PRGT initiated consultation directly with Luux Hon on May 21, 2013 through a letter introducing the proposed Project and the Alice Arm route alternative in particular.

General Project Information

PRGT met with representatives from Gitanyow on several occasions to discuss the proposed Project on March 15, March 22, April 5, April 25, and May 17, 2013. PRGT also met with Gitanyow elected Chief and Council on August 14, 2013 to discuss the proposed Project.

PRGT met with representatives from Luux Hon to introduce the company and discuss the proposed Project on May 27, 2013, with further meetings held on June 7 and August 29, 2013. PRGT confirmed at the August 29, 2013 meeting that the Alice Arm alternate route was being placed on hold pending further fieldwork. A follow-up letter from PRGT was sent to Luux Hon on August 31, 2013 to confirm what was discussed in the meeting.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Gitanyow about environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview presentation on the scope, methodology and timing of the proposed environmental field program on April 14, 2013.

PRGT provided Gitanyow with a geotechnical investigative program summary on May 14, 2013. This summary described the planned geotechnical investigations in Gitanyow territory. Maps and a sketch plan were made available on a SharePoint site and hard copies of the documents were sent by mail.

PRGT delivered an environmental program overview brochure on May 21, 2013. This overview included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor. PRGT provided an update on the status of the Heritage Inspection permit on July 16, 2013.

PRGT notified Gitanyow of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on the applications on June 1, 2013. Follow-up occurred to provide a status update and request comments on the geotechnical permit applications in September 2013. PRGT made revisions to the fieldwork plan for two borehole sites in response to Gitanyow feedback.

7.1.2 Routing

PRGT has had many discussions with Gitanyow, both through email and in-person meetings regarding routing issues, since consultation was initiated in January 2013.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013 for Gitanyow and on August 8 and September 24, 2013 for Luux Hon.

At the request of Gitanyow, PRGT and Gitanyow established a Route Selection Working Group, which held meetings on July 26, August 9, and September 6, 2013. Gitanyow advised that they did not support PRGT's initial proposed or alternative routes and were concerned with the impact of the route on the Gitanyow Lax'yip Land Use Plan and its objectives. In the course of the Route Selection Working Group meetings, Gitanyow tabled their own route option for discussion that was later called the "Gitanyow preferred route".

Concerns identified by Gitanyow during the Route Selection Working Group included:

- Potential impacts of the route at the proposed Cranberry River crossing, specifically to moose winter range, fish and fish habitat, and goshawk

- PRGT completed a flyover with Gitanyow field experts (August 12, 2013) during the Route Selection Working Group review and moved the crossing to a location acceptable to the Gitanyow.
- PRGT committed to have the entire route walked to ensure all streams were identified and an appropriate mitigation strategy was developed for all crossings. PRGT agreed to have Gitanyow and their local fisheries consultant complete the fisheries assessment work for the route as Gitanyow has qualified local expertise in fisheries.
- Effect of the route on grizzly bears, mountain goat and other wildlife
- Potential impacts to the Nass River of the Alice Arm alternative route
 - PRGT has made the determination not to move forward with the Alice Arm alternative route at this time.

PRGT modified the route to align almost entirely with Gitanyow's preferred route, with seven suggested amendments proposed by PRGT. Gitanyow accepted all of the PRGT amendments and consensus on the revised route was confirmed September 6, 2013.

PRGT completed a flyover with a Luux Hon representative on June 28, 2013 to review the proposed Alice Arm alternate route. The Luux Hon representative confirmed that the PRGT proposed corridor through Luux Hon's Wilp was acceptable. PRGT confirmed at an August 29, 2013 meeting with Luux Hon that the Alice Arm alternate route was being placed on hold at this time.

7.1.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT initiated conversations with Gitanyow about providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA process through an initial LOA and subsequent MOU, their preferred form of which is a Consultation Capacity Agreement (CCA). The LOA was signed on April 4, 2013 and the CCA was signed on May 8, 2013. The CCA included funding for the Traditional Land Use (TLU) and a socio-cultural needs assessment (SCNA).

PRGT also provided Luux Hon with initial capacity funding to participate in consultation activities including fieldwork through a contract with the Luux Hon Company Sim Gyeekx Group Maintenance Ltd. on June 13, 2013.

7.1.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

As discussed in Section 7.1.3, the TLU study (referred to by Gitanyow as the Cultural Impact Study) and its funding were included in the scope of the CCA, which was signed on May 8, 2013. The TLU study, being undertaken internally by Gitanyow, was initiated in June 2013.

7.1.5 Socio-economic

As discussed in Section 7.1.3, the SCNA and its funding were scoped into the CCA. The SCNA study, being undertaken internally by Gitanyow, was initiated in June 2013.

7.1.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Gitanyow regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and Gitanyow members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided Gitanyow with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontractor agreement was established between Gitanyow Huwlip Society DBA Gitanyow Fisheries Authority and Stantec. The contract was established to define the terms and conditions for the provision of professional services with respect to PRGT. Gitanyow members have been involved as assistants in Stantec's biophysical assessments. In addition, as per Gitanyow's request, a local consulting company, Cambria Gordon, and Gitanyow led the fisheries study data collection under sub-contract to Stantec, which included Gitanyow participants.

Also, PRGT entered into a contract with Sim Gyeekx Group Maintenance Ltd. for assistance with environmental data collection associated with the Alice Arm alternative route through the Luux Hon Wilp.

7.1.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Gitanyow has expressed an interest in employment and contracting opportunities throughout the life of the proposed Project. PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with Gitanyow.

7.1.8 Next Steps

PRGT will continue to consult with Gitanyow, which will include ongoing dialogue and information exchange. Next steps include participation in a community meeting to review the proposed Project and to seek feedback on consultation to date. PRGT plans to further engage in supply chain management and procurement discussions and initiate Project Agreement discussions with Gitanyow regarding potential short and long-term benefits.

PRGT will continue engagement with Luux Hon by providing Project updates and ongoing dialogue with respect to procurement and contracting opportunities.

7.2 GITXAALA NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Gitxaala Nation (Gitxaala) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Gitxaala.

7.2.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with Gitxaala to introduce the company and discuss the proposed Project on May 2, 2013. PRGT also met with the Chief on several occasions to provide information on the proposed Project and provide Project updates (May 15, July 26, and August 22, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Gitxaala with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental and engineering program overview on May 2 and 15, 2013. The environmental program overview included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply under the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA. The engineering program overview included information on the scope, timing, permitting and opportunities for participation in the engineering fieldwork.

PRGT provided an update on permit applications, including the types of permits being sought, on May 16, 2013. The provision of information on permit applications was ongoing through the summer and fall months.

7.2.2 Routing

The exchange of information and some discussion regarding the PRGT conceptual corridor and alternative marine options occurred in general terms through the meetings identified in Section 7.2.1. However, there have been no substantive discussions with Gitxaala, to date, on specific routing options given that PRGT and Gitxaala have not reached a capacity agreement at this time.

PRGT is interested in having discussions with Gitxaala with regard to the Project's conceptual corridor and marine routing options. Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder (with updates on May 9, June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013).

To date, PRGT has not completed any site visits with Gitxaala. Gitxaala expressed an initial interest in participating in a site visit to one of TransCanada's other resource projects with a potential focus on water crossings. PRGT tried to find a suitable TransCanada project under construction with the right timing and feasibility to arrange a site visit for Gitxaala representatives. PRGT is interested in exploring and discussing details about a potential TransCanada site visit with Gitxaala.

7.2.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT initiated conversations with Gitxaala about providing capacity funding for participation in the EA process in May 2013. At that time, PRGT provided information on various capacity agreements it would like to pursue with Gitxaala for the proposed Project (specifically a LOA and MOU) as well as a Project Agreement. At the outset, Gitxaala indicated that they would prefer to negotiate a more comprehensive MOU/capacity agreement rather proceeding in an incremental way starting with a LOA.

There have been ongoing information exchanges and discussions between Gitxaala and PRGT since May 2013 about how best to complete a capacity agreement to meet the needs and interests of Gitxaala and PRGT. PRGT and Gitxaala have not reached agreement on an MOU or capacity funding agreement at this time.

7.2.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Gitxaala began discussions about TLU data collection in the summer of 2013 and a TLU Protocol Agreement template was provided during these discussions. PRGT and Gitxaala have not reached an agreement on a TLU study at this time. PRGT has continued to communicate its interest in supporting Gitxaala in conducting a TLU study, or through other TLU processes, which would meet the needs of the Nation.

7.2.5 Socio-economic

PRGT has provided information and had preliminary discussions with Gitxaala about the socio-economic study work related to the proposed Project. Communication through email and in-person has occurred regarding the scope and nature of socio-economic study. PRGT is awaiting direction from Gitxaala about how they would like to be engaged in socio-economic data collection.

7.2.6 Fieldwork Participation

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided Gitxaala with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection and shared a draft environmental fieldwork subcontracting agreement with Gitxaala staff during summer 2013. Stantec and Gitxaala have not entered into an agreement at this time.

7.2.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

PRGT has participated in a tour of a Coastal Industrial Construction (Gitxaala owned company) work site to better understand the capacity and services Gitxaala could provide for the proposed Project. In October 2013, PRGT invited Gitxaala to attend a procurement session on long-term procurement possibilities. PRGT will work with Gitxaala businesses and communities on training and other capacity development measures to assist Gitxaala in gaining long-lasting benefits from the proposed Project.

7.2.8 Next Steps

PRGT intends to complete a MOU with Gitxaala to support their capacity to further engage on the proposed Project. PRGT will continue discussions regarding Gitxaala's interest in TLU and socio-economic information gathering and studies. PRGT will also initiate Project Agreement discussions with Gitxaala regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the Project.

7.3 GITXSAN NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Gitxsan Nation (Gitxsan) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Gitxsan.

7.3.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the Hereditary Chiefs of the Wilps along proposed routes to discuss the proposed Project on April 3, May 22, June 25, and September 10, 2013. Environmental fieldwork updates were provided at each meeting with the Hereditary Chiefs.

PRGT met with the Gitxsan Development Corporation staff to discuss the proposed Project on several occasions (March 19, March 22, April 3, April 12, April 18, June 6, July 22, July 19, and October 7, 2013). At the request of the staff, a commitment was made to not begin fieldwork until consultation was initiated with potentially affected Hereditary Chiefs.

PRGT met with Gitxsan Band Councils including Gitsegukla (June 12, 2013), Gitwangak/Kitwanga (June 12, 2013), Kispiox (June 12, 2013) and Gitanmaax (September 4, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Gitxsan with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT discussed its intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on March 20, 2013. PRGT followed up on these applications and offered a site tour to the potentially affected areas on July 9, 2013. Revisions to the fieldwork plan were made to avoid conflict with a forested site of importance to the Gitxsan.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview presentation that covered the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program, including the proposed archaeology activities at an April 18, 2013 meeting. PRGT and Gitxsan discussed questions and concerns at this meeting.

PRGT provided an engineering program overview that covered the scope, timing, permitting process and opportunities for participation in the engineering fieldwork at a May 14, 2013 meeting. Questions and concerns were discussed at this meeting.

PRGT delivered an environmental program overview brochure to Gitxsan on May 20, 2013. This overview included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

7.3.2 Routing

Initial routing discussions with Gitxsan are scheduled to begin at an October 28, 2013 meeting with further conversations to continue at the mid-December Hereditary Chiefs meeting. Helicopter flyovers of the potential route have been offered to the Hereditary Chiefs potentially affected by the proposed Project with the initial flyover

confirmed for November 4, 2013. At this time no specific feedback has been given on the proposed route.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on May 9, June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.3.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT initiated conversations with Gitxsan about providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA process, through an initial LOA and subsequent MOU. The LOA was signed on April 9, 2013 and an addendum to the LOA on May 22, 2013. The negotiations around the MOU are ongoing since June 25, 2013.

7.3.4 Traditional Land Use and Ecological Knowledge

Gitxsan and PRGT began discussions about the collection of TLU data in June 2013. PRGT provided Gitxsan the opportunity to conduct a TLU study through its prime subcontractor Stantec, or if preferred, to complete these activities through a preferred Gitxsan third party contractor. Gitxsan chose to conduct a TLU study with support from Stantec. An agreement regarding the protection of intellectual property and confidentiality of information was signed and funding has been provided to the Gitxsan. Gitxsan is currently collecting the TLU data with support from Stantec.

PRGT provided Gitxsan with the opportunity to be involved in data collection for the Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. Gitxsan decided to have their knowledge holders participate in the Stantec TEK fieldwork associated with both archaeology and fisheries surveys.

7.3.5 Socio-economic

A provision for Gitxsan involvement in socio-economic data collection was included in the above-referenced agreement on TLU and TEK data collection.

7.3.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Gitxsan regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and Gitxsan members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has also provided Gitxsan with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontracting agreement was signed and Gitxsan members have participated in the

collection of the environmental data. Gitxsan knowledge holders also accompanied Stantec on the archaeology fieldwork.

7.3.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

PRGT will work with Gitxsan businesses and communities on training and other capacity development measures to assist Gitxsan in gaining long-lasting benefits from the proposed Project.

7.3.8 Next Steps

PRGT's next steps include finalizing a MOU with Gitxsan and continuing to meet with the potentially affected Huwilps and Chiefs to provide Project and fieldwork updates and responding to any questions or concerns. PRGT will continue to identify and address Gitxsan's routing concerns at the next Chiefs meeting in December. PRGT has also committed to sponsoring a two-day Gimlitwit (meeting of all Gitxsan Hereditary Chiefs) to provide an overview of the proposed Project, answer any questions about PRGT and engage in procurement/supply chain management discussions.

PRGT will also initiate Project Agreement discussions with Gitxsan regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

7.4 HALFWAY RIVER FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Halfway River First Nation (Halfway River) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with Halfway River.

7.4.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with Halfway River to discuss the environmental fieldwork data collection program and to discuss how Halfway River could become involved in the activities on May 22, 2013. PRGT provided an update on opportunities to participate in the environmental fieldwork on August 22, 2013.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Halfway River with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview to Halfway River. This overview included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor (April 24 and July 5, 2013).

PRGT notified Halfway River of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 3, 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications. Additional notifications of applications were provided to Halfway River on September 16, 2013.

7.4.2 Routing

Halfway River has requested the consideration of alternative routes as well as the geotechnical information supporting the current proposed route. Halfway River has identified a concern regarding the proximity of the proposed Project to culturally and environmentally sensitive areas and requested that pipelines be routed through common corridors. PRGT will continue to engage in dialogue regarding routing with Halfway River.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.4.3 Capacity funding

PRGT initiated negotiations with Halfway River around providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA, through a MOU. These negotiations are close to completion.

7.4.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Halfway River are close to finalizing an Agreement, which provides Halfway River with the appropriate funding to conduct a TLU study within agreed-to work plans and timelines. PRGT also provided Halfway River with the opportunity for involvement in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. Halfway River indicated that they wished to collect the TEK data as part of the above referenced TLU study.

7.4.5 Socio-economic

Halfway River signed an agreement with PRGT's contractor Stantec around the collection of the socio-economic data.

7.4.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Halfway River regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and Halfway River members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has also provided Halfway River with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. Halfway River signed a subcontracting agreement with Stantec, and its members have been involved in the environmental fieldwork data collection being conducted.

7.4.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

PRGT will work with Halfway River businesses and community on training and other capacity development measures to assist Halfway River in gaining long-lasting benefits from the proposed Project.

7.4.8 Next Steps

Initial next steps with Halfway River include working with the Council and the Lands Department to identify Aboriginal Interests and issues as they relate to the proposed Project. PRGT will also engage with Halfway River on the contracting opportunities available.

In addition, PRGT will continue Project Agreement discussions initiated with Halfway River regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

7.5 KITSELAS FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Kitselas First Nation (Kitselas) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Kitselas.

7.5.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with Chief Gerow and staff to provide an overview of the proposed Project including a discussion of the conceptual corridor and marine route alternatives on May 30, 2013.

PRGT met with Kitselas staff to discuss the proposed Geothermal Project on July 19, 2013.

PRGT presented a Project overview to Chief Bevan, CEO and staff on October 4, 2013. Chief Bevan and other Kitselas representatives expressed some concern regarding the proposed Project's timelines.

PRGT provided fieldwork updates including:

- Offshore surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 14, August 26, September 16, September 20, September 23, and September 26, 2013).
- Marine surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 17 and July 17, 2013).
- Geotechnical surface inspections (August 1, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Kitselas with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an engineering program overview that covered the scope, timing, permitting process and opportunities for participation in the engineering fieldwork at a meeting on June 11, 2013. Questions and concerns were discussed at this meeting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure during a meeting on June 11, 2013. The overview included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage

Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

PRGT notified Kitselas of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 14, 2013. PRGT followed up to request feedback on potential concerns on several occasions (July 3, August 26, September 16, September 20, September 23 and September 26, and October 4, 2013).

7.5.2 Routing

PRGT engaged Kitselas in discussions on the proposed Project and conceptual corridor in the spring of 2013. Kitselas advised that they had minimal interest in the proposed Project unless there is a marine route. PRGT met with the new Chief to confirm interest in the proposed Project on October 4, 2013. PRGT is arranging further discussions with Kitselas regarding marine/fish issues with Stantec involvement.

7.5.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT initiated conversations with Kitselas around providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA through an initial LOA and subsequent MOU. Kitselas is interested in completing a funding agreement with PRGT. Discussions are ongoing.

7.5.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Kitselas have commenced discussions with respect to gathering TLU information. One key component will be marine resources. While no agreement has been signed to conduct these studies, discussions are underway regarding the scope and format for TLU information gathering.

7.5.5 Socio-economic

PRGT and Kitselas have commenced discussions with respect to gathering socio-economic information. Discussions are underway regarding the scope and format for socio-economic information gathering and possible community participation.

7.5.6 Fieldwork Participation

PRGT works with its contractors to ensure, to the extent possible, that its contractors provide employment and contracting opportunities on their fieldwork to qualified Aboriginal businesses and individuals. PRGT and its contractors will continue to communicate available employment and subcontracting opportunities to Kitselas.

7.5.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Kitselas has expressed an interest in accessing contracting and employment opportunities throughout the life of the proposed Project. In October 2013, PRGT invited Kitselas to attend a procurement session around procurement and contraction opportunities for the proposed Project. PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with Kitselas.

7.5.8 Next Steps

PRGT's immediate next steps for consultation with Kitselas include the completion and signing of a LOA and MOU to provide capacity, to support engagement in the consultation process including the EA, and to confirm the scope and process for participation in the gathering of both TLU and socio-economic information. PRGT is also interested in engaging in continued discussions with Kitselas regarding marine/offshore issues.

7.6 KITSUMKALUM FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Kitsumkalum First Nation (Kitsumkalum) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Kitsumkalum.

7.6.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the Chief to discuss the proposed Project on May 2, 2013 to provide a briefing on the proposed Project, including the conceptual corridor and marine route alternatives, environmental and engineering field programs, procurement and TLU and socio-economic studies.

PRGT participated in a meeting with other proponents as an invitation from Chief Roberts to listen and receive information and knowledge regarding Kitsumkalum Band (history, traditions and practices) on June 19, 2013.

PRGT met with staff on several occasions to discuss updates, fieldwork and environmental studies (June 19, August 15, and October 2, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided fieldwork updates as required including:

- Offshore surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 14, June 17, June 26, July 7, July 9, and August 26, 2013).
- Marine surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 17, June 26, July 7, and August 28, 2013).
- Surface inspections (August 1, 2013).

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Kitsumkalum with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided Kitsumkalum with an engineering program overview that covered the scope, timing, permitting process and opportunities for participation in the engineering fieldwork on May 2, 2013.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure on May 2, 2013. It included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

- Kitsumkalum provided PRGT with feedback on the Heritage Inspection permit on August 15, 2013 and advised that Kleanza was Kitsumkalum's preferred archaeologist and requested that Stantec work with them.

PRGT notified Kitsumkalum of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 14, 2013. PRGT followed-up to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications (August 26, October 2 and October 21, 2013).

PRGT provided information on the Acoustic Doppler Current Profilers (ACDPs), which are being used as part of a larger marine hydrographic study being conducted for the proposed Project (August 28 and September 25, 2013).

7.6.2 Routing

PRGT has had communication both through email and in-person meetings regarding routing issues, primarily connected to discussions regarding the environmental field program since consultation was initiated in January 2013. The main interest and

concern identified with respect to routing is the effect on the marine environment including the more than 100 fish species in existence and fishing access.

Routing shape files were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on May 9, June 13, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.6.3 Capacity funding

PRGT provided initial funding for costs associated with consultation activities, including participation in the EA process, through a LOA signed in June 2013. PRGT provided a draft MOU, which will provide subsequent funding and is currently awaiting a response on this draft.

7.6.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Kitsumkalum continue to have ongoing discussions around the provision of and involvement in the collection of TLU data. One of the concerns identified by Kitsumkalum is the need to collect the TLU data over the course of a year to ensure all seasonal information is gathered. Discussions addressing this issue are ongoing. A TLU protocol agreement was provided to Kitsumkalum and PRGT is currently awaiting a response on the agreement and work plan from Kitsumkalum.

7.6.5 Socio-economic

PRGT and Kitsumkalum have had a series of discussions regarding Kitsumkalum's involvement in the collection of additional community-led socio-economic data collection. Kitsumkalum has put a general proposal forward and TransCanada awaits detailed deliverables and budget to move forward with a sub-contract between Stantec and the Kitsumkalum.

7.6.6 Fieldwork Participation

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided Kitsumkalum with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontractor agreement was established between Stantec and Kitsumkalum. To date, other than the archaeological participation, no knowledge holders have participated in the gathering of this data.

7.6.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Kitsumkalum has expressed an interest in employment and contracting opportunities through the life of the proposed Project. Discussions have occurred with Kitsumkalum regarding procurement opportunities for the proposed Project. In October 2013, PRGT invited Kitsumkalum to attend a procurement session around procurement and contracting opportunities for the proposed Project. PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with Kitsumkalum

7.6.8 Next Steps

The next steps include completing agreements for participation and capacity in the collection of TLU and socio-economic data. PRGT and Kitsumkalum will also work towards signing a MOU to provide capacity, to support Kitsumkalum's engagement in consultation activities including participation in the EA process.

Ongoing discussions will continue regarding marine and fish issues with experts from Kitsumkalum and PRGT/Stantec. PRGT will also seek further engagement with Kitsumkalum on routing.

7.7 LAKE BABINE NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with Lake Babine Nation (Lake Babine) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with Lake Babine.

7.7.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with Chief and Council to discuss the proposed Project (May 31, June 19, and September 24, 2013).

PRGT met with Lake Babine staff to discuss the proposed Project as well as met with the Lake Babine community on July 19 and October 21, 2013.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Lake Babine with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure to Lake Babine on May 10 and 22, 2013. The brochure included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

- PRGT received feedback from Lake Babine on June 17, 2013 advising that Archer will be their third party archaeology consultant and will work with Stantec on the conducting the AIA activities in Lake Babine traditional territory.

PRGT notified Lake Babine of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on May 31, 2013. Follow-up occurred to provide additional notifications and request comments on the geotechnical permit applications on September 24 and October 28, 2013.

7.7.2 Routing

PRGT has requested to discuss routing with Lake Babine but no meetings have occurred to date. PRGT has offered to take Lake Babine on fly-overs of the potential route on several occasions but none have occurred to date.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on April 26, June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.7.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT has expressed a willingness to provide funding to Lake Babine to participate in consultation activities, including participation in the EA process and has provided an initial draft LOA and subsequent draft MOU to Lake Babine for review. PRGT has followed up with Lake Babine regarding the status of the agreements and is currently awaiting a response.

7.7.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT has expressed interest in providing Lake Babine with the opportunity to conduct a TLU study and met with Lake Babine to discuss how they would like to proceed with conducting a TLU study (July 19, 2013). A TLU Protocol Agreement Template has been provided to Lake Babine for review. Follow-up correspondence and communications occurred to schedule additional meetings to discuss the TLU. TLU scoping discussions are ongoing.

PRGT has provided Lake Babine with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. Lake Babine knowledge holders have participated in TEK fieldwork associated with a fisheries survey conducted by Stantec.

7.7.5 Socio-economic

PRGT has contacted Lake Babine about participation in the socio-economic studies but no discussions have occurred to date. Follow-up correspondence and communications occurred to schedule additional meetings to discuss the funding of

the socio-economic study. PRGT is awaiting direction from the Lake Babine regarding how they would like to be engaged in the socio-economic data collection.

7.7.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Lake Babine regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and Lake Babine members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided Lake Babine with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontracting agreement was signed and Lake Babine members have participated in the collection of the environmental fieldwork.

7.7.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Lake Babine has expressed an interest in employment and contracting opportunities through the life of the proposed Project. Lake Babine was invited to attend a procurement session around long-term procurement possibilities on October 15, 2013. A Lake Babine representative attended the session on October 23, 2013. PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with Lake Babine.

7.7.8 Next Steps

PRGT's immediate next steps with Lake Babine are to negotiate an agreement that will provide funding and capacity funding, as required, to participate in consultation activities, including the EA process. PRGT will also continue to follow up with Lake Babine to organize a fly-over in order to initiate routing discussions. Furthermore PRGT wishes to organize a meeting with Lake Babine to discuss infrastructure required for PRGT.

PRGT will also continue Project Agreement discussions initiated with Lake Babine regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the Project.

7.8 LAX KW'ALAAMS BAND

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Lax Kw'alaams Band (Lax Kw'alaams) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with Lax Kw'alaams.

7.8.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the Chief, Council members and staff to provide information on the proposed Project and provide Project updates (May 1 and July 3, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

Provided fieldwork updates including:

- Offshore surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 16, June 25, and July 9, 2013).
- Marine surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 16 and July 17, 2013).

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Lax Kw'alaams with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided Lax Kw'alaams with an environmental and engineering program overview on May 1 and July 3, 2013. The environmental overview included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor. The engineering program overview included information on the scope, timing, permitting and opportunities for participation in the engineering fieldwork.

- As an outcome of these discussions Lax Kw'alaams confirmed Kleanza as their preferred third party consultant to conduct archaeological work.

PRGT provide Lax Kw'alaams with an update on the permits for field programs based on previously shared information regarding the environmental and engineering field programs, which included information on the scope, timing, permitting and opportunities for participation in engineering fieldwork on May 15, 2013.

PRGT notified Lax Kw'alaams of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on May 15, 2013. PRGT

followed up with Lax Kw'alaams to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications on June 16, July 9 and August 29, 2013.

PRGT provided information to Lax Kw'alaams about the Park Use Permit submissions (July 19 and August 16, 2013) and engaged in subsequent communication regarding the Park Use Permits and Lax Kw'alaams opposition to activities being undertaken in the Khutzeymateen conservancy.

PRGT provided an update on the offshore (marine) survey work for the proposed Project including a description of the Crown land application on August 29, 2013.

PRGT provided information on the use of Acoustic Doppler Current Profilers (ADCPs) as part of a larger marine hydrographic study being conducted for the proposed Project on August 29, 2013. This included information on the current meters.

7.8.2 Routing

PRGT has engaged in information exchanges and discussions regarding routing issues through email, phone and in-person meetings with Lax Kw'alaams since consultation began in January of 2013.

From the initial project briefing in May 2013 and following receipt of a Park Use Permit application in July 2013, Lax Kw'alaams communicated that they did not support the proposed location for the pipeline through conservancies. In August 2013, Lax Kw'alaams indicated that they wished to form a Joint Route Review process to develop routes acceptable to Lax Kw'alaams. The first joint review meeting was held on September 19 and 20, 2013 with Lax Kw'alaams Council members (Rights and Title Committee) and Embark Engineering (a Lax Kw'alaams owned company).

PRGT provided a technical overview of the proposed Project including onshore and offshore routing, provided a Google Earth flyover of the conceptual corridor and alternative marine options, and made a presentation on and discussed the environmental and engineering field programs. Lax Kw'alaams identified a concern regarding potential impacts on marine environments including fish and on bear and wildlife habitats. PRGT is interested in continuing routing discussions through the Joint Route Review process.

Routing shape files were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on May 7, June 13, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.8.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT has initiated conversations with Lax Kw'alaams around providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA

process, through an initial LOA and subsequent MOU. Lax Kw'alaams preferred to negotiate a MOU with PRGT and discussions regarding a draft MOU are ongoing.

7.8.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Lax Kw'alaams are currently engaged in discussions regarding an Aboriginal Interest and Use Study (AIUS). PRGT has provided a TLU Protocol Agreement Template to Lax Kw'alaams and is currently in discussions with Embark Engineering to scope the AIUS study.

Lax Kw'alaams requested that the Lax Kw'alaams Fishing Enterprises Ltd. be involved in the collection of the TEK data. A sub-contracting agreement was established between the two parties for the provision of this information.

7.8.5 Socio-economic

PRGT confirmed its interest in supporting Lax Kw'alaams inclusion in socio-economic data collection. PRGT is awaiting direction from Lax Kw'alaams regarding how they would like to be involved. Discussions are ongoing.

7.8.6 Fieldwork Participation

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has also provided Lax Kw'alaams with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. Lax Kw'alaams signed an environmental fieldwork subcontracting agreement with Stantec.

7.8.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Lax Kw'alaams has expressed strong interest in immediate and ongoing business opportunities, which align with their business partnerships, expertise, and interests, which will support economic opportunities for Lax Kw'alaams. PRGT has met with Lax Kw'alaams regarding their business interests and capacity and will work to identify and further explore opportunities with Lax Kw'alaams.

7.8.8 Next Steps

A priority for PRGT is completing and signing the MOU and negotiating and concluding a PRGT Project Agreement with Lax Kw'alaams. PRGT is interested in continuing to discuss the routing options with Lax Kw'alaams, as well as, completing agreements on the collection of Aboriginal interest and use and socio-economic information.

7.9 MCLEOD LAKE INDIAN BAND

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with McLeod Lake Indian Band (McLeod Lake) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with McLeod Lake.

7.9.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the McLeod Lake Land Department to discuss the environmental fieldwork data collection program and how McLeod Lake could become involved in the activities on May 29, 2013.

PRGT met with Chief and Council to discuss a Project Agreement (June 27 and September 11, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged McLeod Lake with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure on April 24 and July 5, 2013. It included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

PRGT notified McLeod Lake of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 3, 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications. An additional notification of a Crown land application was provided on September 16, 2013.

7.9.2 Routing

To date McLeod Lake has not identified any specific routing issues.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7, and September 24, 2013.

7.9.3 Capacity funding

PRGT has initiated discussions with McLeod Lake regarding providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities including participation in the EA process through an initial LOA and subsequent MOU. While McLeod Lake has not indicated an interest in signing an LOA they are currently engaged in MOU negotiations with PRGT.

7.9.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT originally engaged McLeod Lake around the gathering of a TLU study in May 2013. Several attempts at initiating the TLU study were made by PRGT and a draft Protocol Agreement was provided to McLeod Lake in September 2013. Discussions regarding the TLU study are currently ongoing.

PRGT has also provided McLeod Lake with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the programs, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. While a sub-contracting agreement was established between the two parties, McLeod Lake has yet to participate in the TEK fieldwork. At the request of McLeod Lake, a confidentiality agreement was established with Stantec to ensure the confidentiality of any information shared.

7.9.5 Socio-economic

There has been no engagement on socio-economic activities to date.

7.9.6 Fieldwork Participation

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided McLeod Lake with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontracting agreement was signed between McLeod Lake and Stantec and its members have been involved in the environmental fieldwork data collection being conducted.

7.9.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

McLeod Lake has expressed an interest in employment and contracting opportunities throughout the life of the proposed Project. PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with McLeod Lake.

7.9.8 Next Steps

Immediate next steps with McLeod Lake include a Chief and Council meeting on November 12, 2013 to continue discussions with McLeod Lake to identify Aboriginal

Interests and concerns as they relate to the proposed Project. PRGT will also engage with McLeod Lake on contracting opportunities available.

In addition, PRGT will continue Project Agreement discussions initiated with McLeod Lake regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the Project.

7.10 METLAKATLA FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Metlakatla Nation (Metlakatla) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Metlakatla.

7.10.1 Information exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the Chief and senior staff on several occasions to discuss the proposed Project (March 25, July 3, and July 25, 2013).

PRGT met and participated in conference calls with Metlakatla staff on several occasions to discuss the proposed Project (April 25, June 11, June 20, July 3, July 10, July 11, July 16, July 25, July 26, August 13, August 20, September 11, September 16, and October 2, 2013). Through these meetings and other communications, agreements were signed regarding capacity funding, TLU and participation in the environmental fieldwork.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided fieldwork updates as required including:

- Offshore surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 17, June 25, June 27, July 9, August 26, and October 21, 2013).
- Marine surveys including details on scope and status, opportunities for participation and schedule (June 14, July 16, August 28, and September 25, 2013).
- Environmental field program on an ongoing basis as new information is available (August 25, September 16, September 18, September 25, and October 2, 2013).

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Metlakatla with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided Metlakatla an update on the permits for field programs based on the environmental field program and engineering program overviews, including information on the scope, timing, permitting and opportunities for participation in engineering fieldwork through email April 29, 2013.

PRGT delivered environmental program overview presentations on May 7, July 25 and October 2, 2013. It included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

- Metlakatla advised PRGT that Kleanza Consulting is the preferred archaeologist to conduct archaeological fieldwork in Metlakatla traditional territory. Stantec signed a subcontracting agreement with Kleanza Consulting to conduct archaeological work.
- PRGT provided Metlakatla with an update on the scientific fish collection, geotechnical investigations, offshore surveys permit applications on May 15, 2013.

PRGT notified Metlakatla of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 4, 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments from Metlakatla on the geotechnical permit applications (August 26, October 2 and October 21, 2013).

PRGT provided Metlakatla information on Park Use Permit submissions and engaged in subsequent correspondence regarding the Park Use Permits (July 19, July 30 and August 16, 2013). Metlakatla identified a concern regarding the Parks Act Permit application to undertake non-invasive fieldwork in the conservancies. PRGT is using this feedback to help inform routing decisions.

PRGT provided information on the Acoustic Doppler Current Profilers (ADCP) work as part of the larger marine hydrographic study being conducted for the proposed Project. PRGT advised Metlakatla that this program is being conducted to support both the EA and planning and engineering of the proposed Project (August 28, August 29 and August 31, 2013).

PRGT attended a meeting with Metlakatla and its preferred contractor Triton to discuss the environmental fieldwork including methodologies and timeframes and locations, in addition to how Triton and Metlakatla could fill the gaps on October 2, 2013.

7.10.2 Routing

PRGT has engaged in communications through email and in-person meetings regarding routing issues with Metlakatla since consultation was initiated in January of 2013.

Metlakatla Stewardship Office staff requested and participated in a flyover of the conceptual route in the spring of 2013.

PRGT met with Metlakatla on four occasions in July 2013 to discuss routing issues (July 3, July 16, July 25 and July 26, 2013). Metlakatla indicated that routing the pipeline through conservancies is a significant issue. In addition, Metlakatla have identified concerns with the proposed Project's potential effect on bear and wildlife habitat, marine environments and culturally significant areas for traditional use activities. PRGT is engaged in ongoing dialogue with Metlakatla regarding the identified concerns and has taken the following steps to address them:

- PRGT has signed a TLU protocol agreement and is funding a Metlakatla TLU study
- PRGT is engaging in detailed discussions with Metlakatla Stewardship Office on marine and fisheries issues
- PRGT is engaging Metlakatla's consultants, Metlakatla-Triton Environmental, to carry out aspects of the fisheries assessments required for the baseline study
- Dialogue to discuss routing options and concerns is ongoing

Routing shape files were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on May 7, June 13, August 7, and September 24, 2013.

7.10.3 Capacity funding

PRGT provided initial capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA process through an initial LOA. Metlakatla and PRGT signed the LOA on July 10, 2013. Negotiations towards a MOU are ongoing.

7.10.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Metlakatla are close to finalizing an agreement, which provides Metlakatla with funding to conduct a TLU study within agreed to work plans and timelines. PRGT has also provided Metlakatla with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. Metlakatla indicated that they wished to collect the TEK data as part of the above referenced agreement through their TLU study.

7.10.5 Socio-economic

PRGT has initiated discussions regarding conducting a socio-economic study. PRGT received a socio-economic proposal, work plan and budget from Metlakatla on October 15, 2013 and is currently developing a contract to move forward on the proposal through PRGT's prime subcontractor Stantec and Metlakatla.

7.10.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Metlakatla regarding fieldwork opportunities. A subcontracting agreement was signed with Allnorth, and Metlakatla members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cuttings, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided Metlakatla with the opportunity to participate in its biophysical assessment, or if preferred, have the biophysical assessment, or a portion thereof, be conducted by a preferred Metlakatla contractor. Metlakatla identified Triton Environmental Consultants and Kleanza Consulting as the preferred contractors. Stantec established subcontractor agreements with both Triton Environmental Consultants and Kleanza Consulting to provide fisheries and archaeological services respectively within Metlakatla traditional territory for the proposed Project.

In addition, Stantec invited Metlakatla members to participate in training for Marine Mammal Observers (July 17, 2013) and offered participation in the marine mammal survey.

7.10.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Metlakatla has expressed an interest in employment and contracting opportunities throughout the life of the proposed Project. PRGT has engaged in initial discussions with Metlakatla regarding procurement opportunities. In October 2013, PRGT invited Metlakatla to attend a session around procurement and contracting opportunities for the proposed Project. PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with Metlakatla.

7.10.8 Next Steps

PRGT's immediate next steps for consultation with Metlakatla include the completion and signing of two MOU's to provide capacity to participate in the EA process as well as broader engagement. PRGT will also continue Project Agreement discussions initiated with Metlakatla regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

PRGT is seeking opportunities to continue discussions around the routing options and to have a technical discussion regarding marine and offshore issues.

7.11 NAK'AZDLI BAND

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with Nak'azdli Band (Nak'azdli) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with Nak'azdli.

7.11.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the Chief and Council on several occasions to discuss the proposed Project (April 2, May 29, August 13, and August 28, 2013). PRGT also met with staff to discuss the proposed Project (May 1, July 24, October 1, and October 16, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Nak'azdli with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT delivered an environmental program overview brochure in person on May 10, 2013. It included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

PRGT notified Nak'azdli of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 1, 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications.

7.11.2 Routing

PRGT has had many discussions around pipeline routing through email, in-person meetings and fly-overs since consultation was initiated in January 2013. While Nak'azdli declined to

fly the original conceptual, they participated in a fly-over of the South-Central alternative on August 29, 2013. The concerns and responses to the fly-over include:

- Routing via the creeks and rivers southeast of Inzana Lake
 - Routing was developed to avoid as many water crossings as possible. PRGT will revisit if there are other preferred crossings and, if requested, revisit the creek crossings to explain the methods and restoration activities.
- Additional trails increasing access to the area
 - PRGT will attempt to utilize existing trails and no new trails are anticipated. Access, where a shoo-fly may be required, will be short and restored to pre-construction state.
- Right-of-way infringes on a gathering area important to Nak'azdli
 - Bridge nearest to the area is at its closest point 21km from proposed route.
- Routing crosses steep embankments at Phillips Creek
 - PRGT crews scouted and provided a reroute that crossed at a narrow part of the creek with a less severe slope grade.
- Proposed route crossed over two Keyoh Holders traplines and cabins
 - PRGT indicated that the cabins found were not in close proximity to the route (which were 2.0 km and 0.6 km from the route). Awaiting feedback from Nak'azdli on location of additional cabins.

Routing discussions with Nak'azdli are ongoing as PRGT continues to respond to concerns raised.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.11.3 Capacity funding

PRGT provided initial funding for capacity to engage consultation activities, including participation in the EA process, on the proposed Project through a LOA signed with Nak'azdli in June 21, 2013. Nak'azdli and PRGT are in the process of finalizing a MOU.

7.11.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Nak'azdli are close to finalizing an agreement, which provides Nak'azdli with funding to conduct a TLU study within agreed to work plans and timelines..

PRGT also provided Nak'azdli with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork. Nak'azdli knowledge holders have participated in the gathering of TEK fieldwork with Stantec.

7.11.5 Socio-economic

Discussions between PRGT and Nak'azdli regarding the socio-economic studies are ongoing.

7.11.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Nak'azdli regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and Nak'azdli members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has also provided Nak'azdli with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontracting agreement has been signed and Nak'azdli members have participated in the collection of the environmental fieldwork.

7.11.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Nak'azdli has expressed an interest in accessing contracting and employment opportunities throughout the life of the proposed Project. Nak'azdli was invited to attend a field program procurement session on October 15, 2013. Nak'azdli representatives attended this meeting. PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with Nak'azdli.

7.11.8 Next Steps

PRGT and Nak'azdli's immediate next step is a community meeting with Chief and Council on November 28, 2013. Furthermore, PRGT wishes to continue discussions with Nak'azdli around infrastructure required for PRGT.

PRGT will also initiate Project Agreement discussions with Nak'azdli regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

7.12 SAULTEAU FIRST NATIONS

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with the Saulteau First Nations (Saulteau) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with the Saulteau.

7.12.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with Chief and Council and Land Staff to discuss the proposed Project (February 7, April 25, and May 22, 2013). In addition, PRGT met with the community to discuss the proposed Project on February 7, 2013.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Saulteau with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure on April 25, 2013. It included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

PRGT notified Saulteau of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 3, 2013. Follow-up occurred to provide an additional notification and request comments on the geotechnical permit applications on September 16, 2013.

7.12.2 Routing

Upon request of Saulteau, PRGT agreed to fund a review of the proposed route to identify any concerns and potential mitigation measures. PRGT entered into a MOU with Saulteau to provide funding for the review. Helicopter fly-overs were undertaken as part of the route review. The review has been ongoing since July with a final report due in November 2013.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.12.3 Capacity funding

PRGT is expecting to sign an MOU, providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA, with Saulteau at the end of October.

7.12.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

Saulteau and PRGT began discussions regarding the collection of TLU data in summer 2013 and a TLU study proposal was submitted to PRGT on September 16, 2013. PRGT and Saulteau are close to finalizing an agreement, which provides Saulteau with funding to conduct a TLU study within agreed to work plans and timelines.

PRGT also provided Saulteau with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec, or if preferred, to complete these activities through a preferred Saulteau third party contractor. Saulteau signed a subcontracting agreement with Stantec and Saulteau knowledge holders have participated in TEK fieldwork.

7.12.5 Socio-economic

Saulteau sent PRGT a socio-economic study proposal on September 11, 2012. PRGT has requested to discuss the proposal and refine the scope.

7.12.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Saulteau regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and Saulteau members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has also provided Saulteau with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontracting agreement was signed between Saulteau and Stantec to participate in the environmental fieldwork. Saulteau members have been involved as assistants in Stantec's biophysical assessments and Saulteau knowledge holders have participated in environmental and archaeological fieldwork.

7.12.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

PRGT will work with Saulteau businesses and the community on training and other capacity development measures to assist Saulteau in gaining long-lasting benefits from the proposed Project.

7.12.8 Next Steps

Initial next steps with Saulteau include discussing the results of the route review and any identified concerns or interests. PRGT will also engage with Saulteau on contracting opportunities available.

In addition, PRGT will continue Project Agreement discussions initiated with Saulteau regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

7.13 TAKLA LAKE FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with Takla Lake First Nation (Takla Lake) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. PRGT initiated its consultation based on the original conceptual corridor and since making a decision in favour of the South-Central alternative has had discussions with Takla Lake, which are ongoing, to understand their interests in this area.

7.13.1 Information exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with Chief and Council to discuss the proposed Project on several occasions since introducing the proposed Project (March 8, March 27, April 11, April 15, May 31, June 13, July 4, and August 9, 2013). Chief and Council also visited Rainbow Lake to view an active TransCanada pipeline construction site on March 8, 2013.

PRGT met with the community to discuss the proposed Project (March 6, March 7 (Prince George), and June 26, 2013) and met with Takla Lake staff to discuss the proposed Project on August 14, 2013.

PRGT met with the Deputy Chief to introduce PRGT's Supply Chain Management contact on October 8, 2013.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Takla Lake with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview presentation at a meeting on April 15, 2013. The presentation covered the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program, including the proposed archaeology activities. PRGT and Takla Lake discussed questions and concerns at this meeting.

PRT provided an environmental program overview brochure in person at meetings, which included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program (April 15, June 13, June 26, and July 4, 2013).

- Takla Lake advised that Archer CRM Partnership was their preferred contractor for environmental work. A subcontractor agreement was established between Archer CRM Partnership and Stantec to provide environmental and archaeological services within the Takla Lake traditional territory.

7.13.2 Routing

PRGT has engaged in discussions both through email and in-person meetings regarding routing issues with Takla Lake since consultation was initiated in January 2013. Takla Lake participated in a partial fly-over of the original northern route alternative west of Takla Lake on June 26, 2013. Throughout discussions with PRGT, Takla Lake expressed serious concern with the original conceptual corridor in general.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12 and August 7, 2013.

7.13.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT initiated conversations with Takla Lake around providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA, through an initial LOA. Takla Lake and PRGT signed the LOA on June 26, 2013.

7.13.4 Traditional Land use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT initiated discussions with Takla Lake regarding TLU work in respect of the original proposed Project corridor; however, a study work plan and budget were not finalized before the decision to drop the original proposed Project corridor.

PRGT provided Takla Lake with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. A subcontractor agreement was established between Takla Lake and Stantec and knowledge holders

have participated in TEK fieldwork in respect of the original proposed Project corridor.

7.13.5 Socio-economic

PRGT and Takla Lake commenced discussions with respect to gathering socio-economic information in July 2013. PRGT provided the draft Terms of Reference for review on August 22, 2013.

7.13.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged Takla Lake regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth and Focus.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has also provided Takla Lake with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontractor agreement was established and Takla Lake knowledge holders were involved in Stantec's biophysical assessments in respect of the original proposed Project corridor. PRGT and its contractors will continue to communicate employment and subcontracting opportunities to Takla Lake.

7.13.7 Employment/Business Opportunities

In October 2013, PRGT invited Takla Lake to attend a procurement session on long-term procurement possibilities. Takla Lake representatives attended the meeting in Fort St. James on October 23, 2013.

7.13.8 Next Steps

PRGT will seek an opportunity to meet with Takla Lake to better understand the Aboriginal Interests that may be impacted by the proposed Project.

7.14 TL'AZT'EN NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with TI'azt'en First Nation (TI'azt'en) in May 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project upon identification by PRGT of the South-Central route alternative. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with TI'azt'en.

7.14.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the Chief and/or staff on several occasions to discuss the proposed Project (May 29, June 7, and June 11, 2013). In order to ensure effective engagement with Keyoh Holders, TI'azt'en formed a TI'azt'en LNG Working Group. PRGT

participated in LNG Working Group meetings on July 29, August 27, September 18 and October 2, 2013.

PRGT met with community members to discuss the proposed Project on June 18, 2013. PRGT met with TI'azt'en Keyoh Holders Binche Keyoh and Middle River independent of each other on October 16, 2013.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged TI'azt'en with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT delivered an environmental program overview brochure in person, which included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply under the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA (May 29 and July 5, 2013).

- TI'azt'en advised that Archer CRM Partnership was their preferred contractor for environmental work. A subcontractor agreement was established between Archer CRM Partnership and Stantec to provide environmental and archaeological services within the TI'azt'en Territory.

PRGT notified TI'azt'en of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback in September 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications.

- TI'azt'en provided feedback on September 25, 2013 regarding the geotechnical permit, identifying a concern with the potential impact of the proposed Project's crossing at Middle River and the potential impact of the Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) on sockeye salmon spawning grounds. TI'azt'en requested that Keyoh holders be involved in the fieldwork and in identifying the entry site location and requested a meeting with the geotechnical drilling contractor to discuss their methodology, timelines for determining the site and protocol for feedback. A meeting with PRGT, the geotechnical drilling contractor and TI'azt'en staff occurred October 2, 2013. Discussions regarding the concerns identified are ongoing.

In response to TI'azt'en's concerns about HDD, PRGT took TI'azt'en representatives on a site tour of the Peace River in Alberta to view a HDD site on August 15, 2013.

7.14.2 Routing

PRGT has engaged in discussions both through email and in-person meetings regarding routing issues with TI'azt'en since consultation was initiated in May 2013. During these discussions TI'azt'en raised a concern around the pipeline routing through moose habitat in the proposed Tsendzut Protected Area. Following the October 2, 2013 meeting, PRGT proposed two re-route options seeking to address TI'azt'en's concerns. Discussions are ongoing with TI'azt'en regarding routing.

PRGT has also offered TI'azt'en the opportunity to participate in helicopter fly-overs of the study corridor to better understand the routing. To date TI'azt'en have been involved in 2 fly-overs on July 29 and October 1, 2013 with a third fly-over scheduled for October 29, 2013.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.14.3 Capacity funding

PRGT provided capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA, through an initial LOA signed with TI'azt'en. A MOU template has been provided to TI'azt'en and discussions are ongoing.

7.14.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT initiated discussions with TI'azt'en regarding conducting a TLU Study began in July 2013 through meetings and ongoing dialogue with staff, community members, and Keyoh holders. Issues regarding the timing and capacity of TI'azt'en to conduct a TLU were discussed. PRGT and TI'azt'en are currently in discussions to finalize a TLU Protocol Agreement.

PRGT provided TI'azt'en with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. A subcontractor agreement was established between EnviroPro, on behalf of TI'azt'en, and Stantec, which defines the terms and conditions for the provision of services with respect to PRGT. TI'azt'en knowledge holders have participated in TEK fieldwork from August to October 2013, which included archaeology work, terrestrial ecosystem mapping, vegetation and fisheries surveys.

7.14.5 Socio-economic

PRGT initiated discussions with TI'azt'en over a socio-economic study and is currently awaiting a proposal and gap analysis from TI'azt'en.

7.14.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractors, Allnorth, Focus, and BGC, engaged TI'azt'en regarding fieldwork opportunities. Subcontracting agreements were signed with Allnorth, Focus and BGC, and TI'azt'en members participated in fieldwork for each contractor in positions including line cutting, wildlife monitors, cultural monitors, medics, and field support technicians.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided TI'azt'en with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontracting agreement was signed through EnviroPro and TI'azt'en members have participated in the collection of the environmental fieldwork.

7.14.7 Employment/Business Opportunities

TI'azt'en has expressed an interest in accessing contracting and employment opportunities throughout the life of the proposed Project. TI'azt'en was invited to attend a field program procurement session on October 15, 2013. TI'azt'en representatives attended the meeting on October 23, 2013.

7.14.8 Next Steps

PRGT's immediate next steps include continuing discussions around infrastructure locations, to address TI'azt'en's concern about the compressor station, and the Middle River HDD crossing. PRGT is also looking to organize a meeting with the TI'azt'en community.

In addition, PRGT will initiate Project Agreement discussions with TI'azt'en regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

7.15 WEST MOBERLY FIRST NATIONS

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with West Moberly First Nations (West Moberly) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with West Moberly.

7.15.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT and West Moberly representatives (Council and Lands Department) have regularly scheduled monthly meetings to discuss the proposed Project, share information and discuss any issues and Aboriginal Interests (February 27, March 18, April 17, May 8, July 31, August 28, and October 16, 2013).

A community meeting was held in West Moberly on June 13, 2013 to share Project information with community members, Band staff and contractors.

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged West Moberly with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure on April 17, 2013. It included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

PRGT notified West Moberly of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback on June 3, 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications. An additional notification of a Crown land application was provided on September 16, 2013.

7.15.2 Routing

Upon early consultation on the proposed route, West Moberly noted that the proposed corridor was too close to Beatty Peaks and core caribou habitat. In follow up to that concern, PRGT organized an April 17, 2013 meeting to provide Chief and Council and the Lands Department staff the opportunity to review the proposed corridor using Google Earth. As a result of the digital 'fly-over' of the proposed routing, PRGT and West Moberly identified an alternative corridor, which exhibited less of a potential adverse impact on known areas of interest to West Moberly, including key caribou habitat and sacred areas. PRGT revised the proposed route to the alternative corridor identified by West Moberly, which is now part of PRGT's study corridor.

West Moberly representatives visited the site during the TEK and TLU studies. No additional flyovers have been offered or requested to date.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on May 7, June 13, August 7, and September 24, 2013.

7.15.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT has initiated conversations with the West Moberly around providing capacity funding for participation in consultation activities including participation in the EA process, through an initial LOA and subsequent MOU. While West Moberly were not interested in signing a LOA, they have been involved in MOU negotiations with PRGT since the spring of 2013.

7.15.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and West Moberly initially engaged in discussions around a TLU study in June 2013 and are currently engaged in discussions to finalize a TLU Agreement.

PRGT has also provided West Moberly with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the programs, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. While a sub-contracting agreement was established between the two parties, West Moberly has yet to participate in the TEK fieldwork. At the request of West Moberly, a confidentiality agreement was established with Stantec to ensure the confidentiality of any information shared.

7.15.5 Socio-economic

Socio-economic data collection was briefly discussed at a West Moberly Chief and Council meeting on June 13, 2013. PRGT is awaiting direction from West Moberly on preferred involvement in the socio-economic data collection.

7.15.6 Fieldwork Participation

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has provided West Moberly with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. West Moberly signed a subcontracting agreement with Stantec and its members have been involved in the environmental fieldwork data collection being conducted.

7.15.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

PRGT will work with West Moberly businesses and the community on training and other capacity development measures to assist West Moberly in gaining long-lasting benefits from the proposed Project.

7.15.8 Next Steps

Initial next steps with West Moberly include continuing to work with the Council and the Lands Department to identify issues and interests as they relate to the proposed Project. PRGT will also engage with West Moberly on the contracting opportunities available.

In addition, PRGT will initiate Project Agreement discussions with West Moberly regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

7.16 YEKOOCHÉ FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated its consultation activities with Yekooche First Nation (Yekooche) in May 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project, upon identification by PRGT of the South-Central route alternative. Since then, PRGT has engaged in a variety of consultation activities with Yekooche.

7.16.1 Information Exchange

General Project Information

PRGT met with the Chief and Council and/or its representatives to introduce the company and discuss the proposed Project (May 22 and July 22, 2013). PRGT also met with Yekooche staff to discuss the proposed Project (August 16, September 25, and October 3, 2013).

PRGT provided the Project Description and its updates (for reference these were dated June 2, July 26, and August 16, 2013). Project Description maps were uploaded to a folder on the external PRGT SharePoint site.

PRGT provided monthly Project activity updates through email beginning in July 2013. Each update included a description of the purpose of the environmental fieldwork as well as information on recently completed components of the environmental study and general timelines for upcoming work.

Fieldwork and Permitting

PRGT has engaged Yekooche with respect to environmental and engineering fieldwork and associated permitting.

PRGT provided an environmental program overview brochure (May 28 and July 5, 2013). It included information on the scope, methodology and timing of the environmental field program and PRGT's plans to apply for a Heritage Inspection permit pursuant to Section 14 of the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* to conduct an AIA at various locations along the conceptual route corridor.

- Feedback was received from Yekooche on May 26, 2013 confirming that Terra Archaeology will work with Stantec to conduct the AIA in Yekooche traditional territory.

PRGT notified Yekooche of the intent to submit Crown land applications to conduct geotechnical investigations and requested feedback in June 2013. Follow-up occurred to request comments on the geotechnical permit applications. Additional notifications for Crown land applications were provided in September 2013.

7.16.2 Routing

PRGT has requested the opportunity to discuss routing with Yekooche since consultation was initiated in May 2013. Specific routing discussions have not occurred and no substantial concerns have been raised with respect to the routing to date.

PRGT has offered to take Yekooche representatives on a helicopter fly-over of the proposed route but none have been conducted to date.

Routing shapefiles were provided through a SharePoint folder and updated on June 12, August 7 and September 24, 2013.

7.16.3 Capacity Funding

PRGT provided initial capacity funding for participation in consultation activities, including participation in the EA, through a LOA signed with Yekooche on July 3, 2013. Negotiations towards a MOU are close to completion.

7.16.4 Traditional Land Use and Traditional Ecological Knowledge

PRGT and Yekooche are close to signing a TLU Agreement, which provides Yekooche with funding to conduct a TLU study within agreed-to work plans and timelines.

PRGT has also provided Yekooche with the opportunity to be involved in the collection of data for the TEK fieldwork, through its prime subcontractor Stantec. Yekooche indicated that they wished to collect the TEK data as part of the above referenced agreement.

7.16.5 Socio-economic

PRGT has initiated dialogue with Yekooche regarding conducting a socio-economic study and Yekooche has signed an agreement with Stantec to conduct the work.

7.16.6 Fieldwork Participation

At PRGT's direction, its engineering fieldwork contractor, Allnorth, engaged Yekooche regarding fieldwork opportunities. A subcontracting agreement was signed with Allnorth.

Through its environmental prime contractor Stantec, PRGT has also provided Yekooche with the opportunity to participate in the environmental fieldwork data collection. A subcontracting agreement was signed although no Yekooche members have participated in the collection of the environmental fieldwork to date.

7.16.7 Employment and Business Opportunities

Yekooche has expressed an interest in accessing contracting and employment opportunities throughout the life of the proposed Project. In response Yekooche was invited to attend the initial field program procurement session (October 15, 2013). PRGT will continue to explore these opportunities with Yekooche.

7.16.8 Next Steps

PRGT and Yekooche's next steps include organizing a community meeting to help solicit information on the proposed Project from the Yekooche community in addition to setting up a fly-over to assist Yekooche in providing information on the proposed routing and identifying any interests or issues. PRGT will also continue dialogue with Yekooche with respect to permitting activities in their traditional territory. In addition, PRGT will continue Project Agreement discussions initiated with Yekooche regarding potential short and long-term benefits of the proposed Project.

8.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES WITH SCHEDULE C ABORIGINAL GROUPS AND MÉTIS

8.1 BLUEBERRY RIVER FIRST NATIONS

PRGT initiated consultation activities with Blueberry River First Nations (Blueberry River) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has given Blueberry River Project information including, but not limited to, information on PRGT's environmental field programs, regulatory documents and Project updates. PRGT has met with Blueberry River Chief, Council and/or staff on several occasions (February 15, April 15, May 30, July 10, August 19, August 23, August 30, September 3, September 4, September 16, October 10 and October 16, 2013) to discuss the proposed Project including agreements and TLU, TEK and biophysical studies. A subcontract agreement was established by Blueberry River and Stantec, and Blueberry River members have participated as assistants on environmental field programs and as knowledge holders in TEK fieldwork associated with environmental field programs (specifically archaeology and vegetation surveys). Blueberry River has expressed an interest in conducting a TLU study related to the proposed Project and a TLU Protocol Agreement is currently being negotiated. Blueberry River has started a TLU study related to the proposed Project. PRGT will continue to engage Blueberry River and provide regular Project updates.

8.2 CARRIER SEKANI TRIBAL COUNCIL

PRGT initiated consultation activities with the Carrier Sekani Tribal Council (CSTC) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has given CSTC Project information through Project updates and the provision of regulatory documents. PRGT has presented information about the proposed Project to CSTC staff, potentially affected CSTC affiliated member Nations (Nak'azdli, Takla Lake, Tl'azt'en), as well as other CSTC affiliated member Nations. If requested, CSTC will provide coordination, support and advice for member Nations on the proposed Project. PRGT entered into a Capacity Funding Agreement with CSTC on October 15, 2013 to provide funding to enable CSTC to effectively engage with PRGT and to facilitate engagement and information exchange amongst its member Nations. PRGT will continue to provide CSTC regular Project updates.

8.3 DOIG RIVER FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated consultation activities with Doig River First Nation (Doig River) in January 2013 by providing formal notification for the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has given Doig River Project information including, but not limited to, information on PRGT's environmental field programs, regulatory documents and Project updates. In PRGT's initial meeting with Doig River on May 7, 2013, Doig River expressed an interest in participating in the TEK fieldwork as a Treaty 8 First Nation. A sub-contract agreement was established between Doig River and Stantec, and Doig River members have participated as assistants on environmental field

programs and as knowledge holders in TEK fieldwork associated with the environmental field programs, specifically archaeology and vegetation surveys. Doig River has also expressed interest in conducting a TLU study for the proposed Project. During a meeting on July 24, 2013, PRGT offered to provide funding to Doig River to support representative community members to undertake a site visit. To date, Doig River has not submitted a proposal or budget for this activity. PRGT will continue to provide Doig River with regular Project updates.

8.4 FORT NELSON FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated consultation activities with Fort Nelson First Nation (Fort Nelson) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has given Fort Nelson Project information through Project updates and the provision of regulatory documents. PRGT has met with Fort Nelson twice - to introduce the proposed Project on February 20, 2013, and to provide a Project update on September 16, 2013. In the first meeting, Fort Nelson advised PRGT that the proposed Project falls outside of their consultation area but, as a Treaty 8 First Nation, they would like to be kept informed of the proposed Project. PRGT will continue to provide Fort Nelson with regular Project updates.

8.5 MÉTIS

PRGT informed Kelly Lake Métis Settlement Society (KLMSS) and Métis Nation British Columbia (MNBC) of the proposed Project in January 2013 and since that time since then, has provided them with Project updates. At the request of KLMSS and MNBC, PRGT has also presented on the proposed Project to members of these organizations. An LOA for the provision of capacity funding was signed between PRGT and KLMSS in October 2013. While TransCanada has an existing MOU with MNBC to provide capacity funding to assist with all TransCanada projects in BC, in September 2013, PRGT signed a TLU Protocol Agreement with MNBC to provide funds in exchange for access to MNBC's existing TLU database. PRGT has engaged other Métis communities on the proposed Project, and will be hosting workshops open to all Métis communities in Fort St. John, Prince George and Prince Rupert.

8.6 OFFICE OF THE WET'SUWET'EN

PRGT initiated consultation with the Office of the Wet'suwet'en in November 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project and continues to provide the Office of Wet'suwet'en with regular Project updates.

8.7 PROPHET RIVER FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated consultation activities with Prophet River First Nation (Prophet River) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has given Project information to Prophet River through Project updates and the provision of regulatory documents. PRGT has met with Prophet River twice - to

introduce the proposed Project on February 27, 2013, and to provide a Project update on September 19, 2013. In the first meeting, Prophet River requested to be kept informed of the proposed Project as a Treaty 8 First Nation. PRGT will continue to provide Prophet River with regular Project updates.

8.8 TREATY 8 TRIBAL ASSOCIATION

PRGT initiated consultation activities with the Treaty 8 Tribal Association in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has given the Treaty 8 Tribal Association Project information through Project updates and the provision of regulatory documents. PRGT has presented information on the proposed Project to Treaty 8 Tribal Association staff and Treaty 8 Tribal Association affiliated Aboriginal groups (West Moberly, Saulneau, Halfway River, Doig River and Prophet River). PRGT will continue to provide the Treaty 8 Tribal Association with regular Project updates.

8.9 TSAY KEH DENE FIRST NATION

PRGT initiated consultation activities with Tsay Keh Dene First Nation (Tsay Keh Dene) in January 2013 by providing formal notification of the proposed Project. Since then, PRGT has given Tsay Keh Dene Project information including, but not limited to, information on PRGT's environmental field programs, regulatory documents and Project updates. In July 2013, Tsay Keh Dene advised PRGT of their decision to disengage from the consultation process in respect of the proposed Project and stated that they do not want PRGT to report on any consultation activities. In September 2013, PRGT notified Tsay Keh Dene of the decision to pursue the South-Central route option, which is located outside of Tsay Keh Dene's traditional territory. PRGT will continue to send Project updates to Tsay Keh Dene.

9.0 SUMMARY OF ABORIGINAL INTERESTS AND CONCERNS

In consultation with Aboriginal groups to date, PRGT has identified a number of Aboriginal Interests and concerns. PRGT expects that its understanding of Aboriginal Interests will evolve over time, including as a direct result of ongoing consultation with Aboriginal groups. The potential adverse effects of the proposed Project on these Aboriginal Interests and concerns, as well as those identified by PRGT through secondary sources, have been summarized in Table 9-1. Sample mitigation measures are also provided.

In the draft of the Report shared with Aboriginal groups on Schedule B of the Order, PRGT included potential mitigation measures. Some Aboriginal groups commented that they had not been involved in discussions on mitigation and expressed a reluctance to accept these mitigations before discussion. As a result, PRGT has amended the table to reflect sample mitigation measures. PRGT will continue to refine and consider new potential mitigation measures based on this specific feedback and on-going consultation activities with Aboriginal groups as well as input from the Working Group, public feedback and further analysis by PRGT.

In January 2014, PRGT proposes to review the second Aboriginal Consultation Report with Aboriginal groups, which will include a set of potential mitigation measures based on the feedback noted above.

Finally, in addition to ongoing efforts by PRGT to meet with and respond to concerns, Aboriginal groups will have multiple opportunities to review and comment on proposed mitigation measures contained in the Application for an EAC during the 180-day Application review phase of the EA process which is anticipated to begin in April, 2014.

Table 9-1: Aboriginal Interests and Concerns

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Cultural	Potential effect on and protection of heritage/cultural/traditional use resources.	Offer to conduct TLU with Aboriginal groups to identify Heritage/Cultural/Traditional Use Areas. Where identified, site specific mitigation will be developed in consultation with the affected Aboriginal group. Complete an Archeological Impact Assessment (AIA) to locate and characterize cultural and heritage sites which may be present before any Project related ground disturbing activities. Develop and implement a Heritage Resources Management Plan (HRMP) for the proposed Project. The HRMP will outline the process for the development of appropriate site-specific management procedures - with input from Archaeology Branch and Aboriginal groups - considering site type, integrity, cultural value and scientific significance

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Cultural	Potential effect on heritage/cultural resources, archaeological sites, culturally modified trees as a result of the proposed Project.	Offer to conduct TLU with Aboriginal groups to identify Heritage/Cultural/Traditional Use Areas. Where identified, site specific mitigation will be developed in consultation with the affected Aboriginal group. Complete an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) to locate and characterize cultural and heritage sites which may be present prior to any Project related ground disturbing activities. Develop and implement a Heritage Resources Management Plan (HRMP) for the proposed Project. The HRMP will outline the process for the development of appropriate site-specific management procedures - with input from Archaeology Branch and Aboriginal groups - considering site type, integrity, cultural value and scientific significance
Cultural	Potential effects of Project on unidentified burial sites.	The potential presence of burial sites was considered at an early stage of Project design and the proposed footprint completely avoids any known (recorded) burial sites. Complete an AIA study to locate and characterize protected heritage sites (including burial sites) which may be present, prior to any Project related ground disturbing activities. If the AIA identifies any previously unrecorded burial sites in conflict with the proposed development footprint, every effort will be made to avoid the sites through Project redesign.
Cultural	Potential loss of traditional territory landscapes and traditional ecological knowledge due to land disturbance.	Offer to conduct TLU with Aboriginal groups to identify Heritage/Cultural/Traditional Use Areas. Where identified, site specific mitigation will be developed in consultation with the affected Aboriginal group.
Cultural	Potential increased access by non-Aboriginal/non-local individuals to sacred sites.	Develop an Access Management Plan that considers the potential increase of access to sacred sites
Gathering	Potential disturbance of rare plants, plant communities and gathering sites.	Offer to conduct TLU with Aboriginal groups to identify Heritage/Cultural/Traditional Use Areas. Where identified, site specific mitigation will be developed in consultation with the affected Aboriginal group. Pre-construction surveys will be conducted to identify occurrences of rare plants or listed ecological communities. Clearly fence and mark identified rare plant locations or gathering sites along the right-away before the start of construction activities. Review mitigation for rare plants / rare ecological communities with Contractor personnel in advance of construction to ensure there is full understanding of the procedures involved.
Gathering	Potential effect of Project-related accidents on plants.	Project-related accidents such as spills will be considered in the Accidents and Malfunctions section of the Application.

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Gathering	Potential effect of PRGT pipeline route on red cedar stands.	Offer to conduct TLU/TEK with Aboriginal groups to identify high value western red cedar stands. Management for such sites will be established on a site-specific basis in discussion with affected Aboriginal group.
Gathering	Potential effect on habitat and abundance of wild berries, traditional medicinal plants, traditionally used trees and other plants.	PRGT will work with Aboriginal groups to identify traditionally important plants and, where practical, develop site specific mitigation
Gathering	Potential effect on habitat and abundance of wild mushrooms including pine mushrooms.	Identify mushroom harvest sites, and where practicable, site specific mitigation will be developed in consultation with the affected Aboriginal group(s).
Gathering	Potential effect on vegetation and landscape as a result of watercourse alteration and drainage patterns.	Watercourse crossings will be designed to minimize potential for alteration of watercourse or drainage patterns, and will be assessed in the hydrology Valued Component of the Application. PRGT will utilize best management practices to minimize impacts on vegetation, including limiting clearing at watercourse crossings to the removal of trees and shrubs to the ditch line and work side areas required for vehicle crossings; minimizing extra temporary workspace within the Riparian Management Area; and installing erosion and sediment control at watercourses and water bodies.
Gathering	Potential effects of invasive plant species.	Develop an invasive species management and monitoring plan to identify and control occurrences of invasive species during and following construction. PRGT will implement a number of measures, as appropriate, to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species during construction. This includes ensuring equipment brought on site is sanitized; that weed infestations are identified prior to construction, and measures taken to manage those sites.
Gathering	Potential removal of SARA listed (White Pine) Tree stands.	White pine trees or stands within the footprint of the proposed Project will be identified and mitigated through avoidance, where possible, and by other means of mitigation.

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Fisheries	Potential effect of Project-related erosion and sedimentation on fisheries and other marine habitat.	<p>PRGT will utilize best management practices to minimize impacts on vegetation, including limiting clearing at watercourse crossings to the removal of trees and shrubs to the ditch line and work side areas required for vehicle crossings; minimizing extra temporary workspace within the Riparian Management Area; and installing erosion and sediment control at watercourses and water bodies.</p> <p>Scheduling of Project activities will be coordinated through consultation with local fish harvesters and other interest groups and best efforts will be made to schedule activities to minimize interference with fisheries, other activities and known biological events (e.g., salmon runs, Pacific herring spawning).</p> <p>Work will comply with stipulations in the Fisheries Act authorizations for HADD and Section 32 approval. In particular, fish habitat compensation programs will be designed, if necessary, to comply with the DFO objective of no-net-loss of the productive capacity of fish habitat.</p> <p>Water quality monitoring plans will be developed, as needed, to monitor for sediment events during in-stream construction activities as required by regulatory approvals</p> <p>Watercourse crossings will be engineered for the specific conditions of each waterbody and PRGT's will ensure compliance to best management practices and regulatory requirements throughout construction and restoration.</p> <p>Use of fill material for rock berms or pipe protection that is free of fines, debris and any substances that would be deleterious to the marine environment.</p> <p>Implement stream bank reclamation measures to re-establish riparian vegetation and fish habitat</p>
Fisheries	Potential effect on fisheries population, migration, spawning grounds and habitat (Dolly Varden, White Fish, Grayling, Trout, White Sturgeon, Sockeye Salmon, Rainbow Trout, Bull Trout, Arctic Grayling, Coarse Fish, Suckers, Char, Lingcod).	<p>Identify sensitive habitats during preliminary routing surveys and, where feasible, design crossing methodology to avoid effects.</p> <p>A Fish Collection Permit from BC MFLNRO is required for fish salvage activities, and all field work is completed in accordance with applicable terms and conditions.</p> <p>If an isolated crossing method is employed and where recommended by an aquatics specialist (i.e., Qualified Aquatic Environmental Specialist or provincial equivalent), conduct a fish salvage led by an aquatics specialist and in accordance with permit conditions, using appropriate methods and equipment. Release all captured fish to areas downstream of the crossing that provide suitable habitat.</p>

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Fisheries	<p>Potential impacts of the proposed Project on the marine and offshore environment including fish and fish habitat, other resources and their habitats (e.g., shellfish, marine mammals) and marine transportation.</p>	<p>Freshwater and Marine mitigation</p> <p>Scheduling of Project activities will be coordinated through consultation with local fish harvesters and other interest groups and best efforts will be made to schedule activities to minimize interference with fisheries, other activities and known biological events (e.g., salmon runs, Pacific herring spawning).</p> <p>Work will comply with stipulations in the Fisheries Act authorizations for HADD and Section 32 approval. In particular, fish habitat compensation programs will be designed, if necessary, to comply with the DFO objective of no-net-loss of the productive capacity of fish habitat.</p> <p>Best management practices will be employed if HDD used at entry points including approved drill fluids.</p> <p>Silt curtains may be used during dredging and any related construction to minimize the transportation of suspended sediments, where feasible and appropriate.</p> <p>Freshwater specific mitigation</p> <p>Erosion and sediment control at any riparian works</p> <p>See mitigation for potential effects on fisheries populations, above</p> <p>Marine specific mitigation</p> <p>Best management practices will be employed if HDD is used for pipeline construction to minimize mortality and disturbance in the marine riparian, intertidal and sub tidal environment, as far as practicably feasible.</p> <p>Best management practices for hydro testing in marine environment and approval for discharges.</p> <p>Use of fill material for rock berms or pipe protection that is free of fines, debris and any substances that would be deleterious to the marine environment.</p> <p>Erosion and sediment control at any shoreline works.</p>

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Hunting	Altered wildlife migration patterns, changes in species behaviour and habitat fragmentation.	<p>Complete pre-construction wildlife surveys to identify habitat features that warrant mitigation</p> <p>Recommended mitigation will pertain to the following where relevant: protection of raptor nests (setbacks and timing), protection of heron nests (setbacks and timing), general timing restrictions (e.g., caribou, goat, bear dens, others), specific General Wildlife Measures from legally designated areas (e.g., UWR and WHA), and salvage/relocation of amphibians (e.g., coastal tailed frog, western toad).</p> <p>Complete construction as quickly as practical, to minimize disturbance to wildlife.</p> <p>Leave gaps in windrows (i.e., grubbing piles, topsoil, grade spoil, rollback) and strung pipe at obvious drainages and wildlife trails, and to allow for passage across the right-of-way.</p> <p>Develop an Access Management Plan for construction and post-construction</p> <p>Design visual sight line blocks to the right-of way, where appropriate (e.g., berms, vegetation screening)</p>
Hunting	Potential effect of route on grizzly bears, mountain goat, goshawks and all of their respective habitats.	<p>Routing of the project has considered potential effects on grizzly bear, mountain goat and northern goshawk. Where information has been available (e.g., important grizzly bear habitat, designated or important areas for mountain goat, northern goshawk nest sites), potential adverse effects have been minimized through routing of the pipeline, to the extent feasible.</p> <p>An appropriate setback and adherence to least risk timing windows will be used to the extent feasible if a northern goshawk nest is known or discovered.</p> <p>Pre-construction surveys, where important wildlife habitat features (e.g., mineral licks, raptor nests, dens) might be adversely affected due to the timing or location of clearing and construction activities, will be completed and mitigation will be applied.</p> <p>Implement recommended mitigative measures for construction activities within provincial grizzly bear zones.</p> <p>Where practical, maintain a minimum 50m setback distance from identified bear dens during winter construction.</p> <p>Restore natural vegetation in accordance with the BC Oil and Gas Regulations. Use natural recovery as the preferred method of reclamation on level terrain and at wetlands.</p>
Hunting	Potential effect of the proposed Project to open trails for increased access to predatory animals to caribou and other wildlife.	<p>Develop an Access Management Plan for construction activities and post-construction to address recreational access.</p> <p>Block access or break up visual sight lines to the right-of way, where appropriate (e.g., use rollback, berms, vegetation screening)</p>

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Hunting	Potential effect on habitat (including winter ranges) and population of moose and black tailed deer.	<p>Provincially-designated areas (UWR or WHA) have been used in routing considerations to reduce potential adverse effects.</p> <p>Pre-construction surveys, where important wildlife habitat features (e.g., mineral licks) might be adversely affected due to the timing or location of clearing and construction activities, will be completed and mitigation will be applied.</p> <p>Schedule clearing and construction activities to avoid relevant ungulate winter ranges, in accordance with provincial timing constraints</p> <p>Leave gaps in windrows (i.e., grubbing piles, topsoil, grade spoil, rollback) and strung pipe at obvious drainages and wildlife trails, and to allow for wildlife and vehicle/machinery passage across the right-of-way. Locations where wildlife gaps are appropriate will be determined in the field by the Environmental Inspector(s).</p> <p>Firearms are not permitted in project vehicles, on the right-of-way, or at associated Project facilities</p> <p>Develop and implement an access management plan that addresses recreational access, including mitigation measures such as blocking access or breaking up visual sight lines to the right-of way, where appropriate (e.g., use rollback, berms, vegetation screening)</p> <p>Restore natural vegetation in accordance with the BC Oil and Gas Regulations. Use natural recovery as the preferred method of reclamation on level terrain and at wetlands.</p>
Hunting	Potential effect on population and habitat of wildlife.	Please see mitigation as described above.
Hunting	Potential for the right of way access opens up new areas to non-aboriginal hunters, which places pressure on subsistence hunting.	<p>Prohibit Project personnel from hunting and carrying firearms in the proposed Project area.</p> <p>Develop an Access Management Plan for construction activities and post-construction to address recreational access.</p> <p>Block access or break up visual sight lines to the right-of way, where appropriate (e.g., use rollback, berms, vegetation screening)</p>
Trapping	Potential effect on habitat and population of marten, wolverine, ferret, groundhog and ermine.	<p>Pre-construction surveys, where important wildlife habitat features (e.g., dens) might be adversely affected due to the timing or location of clearing and construction activities, will be completed and mitigation will be applied.</p> <p>Restrict clearing or removal of stumps, brush and other vegetation to the area within the marked construction footprint boundary</p> <p>Restore natural vegetation in accordance with the BC Oil and Gas Regulations. Use natural recovery as the preferred method of reclamation on level terrain and at wetlands.</p>

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Trapping	Potential effect on traditional trapping areas and camp.	Notify registered trappers at least two weeks prior to construction Allow trappers to have access to their traplines and for moving trapline equipment. Follow guidelines for travelling along the right-of-way to avoid/minimize disturbance of trails. Install signage and schedule construction during periods of least impact to trails.
Trapping	Potential effect on beaver habitat and health (since the beaver pelt has been devalued, their numbers have grown considerably).	In the event that beaver dams or lodges will be disturbed, provide notification or obtain the necessary provincial permits prior to commencing activities. Engage the registered trapper(s). Beaver dams to be removed will require a case-specific review by DFO. Refer to the BC Standards and Best Practices for Instream Work. Breach the beaver dam slowly to avoid the rapid release of water that could cause fish entrapments and/or erosion of the bed and banks resulting in subsequent siltation of downstream waters.
Trapping	Potential for increased public access to disturb traps.	Implement an Access Management Plan to reduce potential for increased public access.
Air	Potential effects of air contamination from the proposed Project.	Compressor stations will be designed and operated to meet regulatory requirements for air emissions. During construction, vehicle idling will be limited, to the extent possible.
Air	Potential effects of increased forest fire potential from human activities and contribution to Greenhouse Gas (GHG)	A Fire Prevention Plan will be developed to address issues like proper disposal methods for welding rods, cigarette butts, smoking. Ensure the Contractor has the necessary fire-fighting equipment on hand that is capable of controlling fires that may occur as a result of their activities, as regulated by Provincial regulations and government agencies. Burning of slash according to regulatory permits and conditions. If burning is delayed, slash will be stored along the right-of-way in approved push-outs. In the event of a fire or high fire hazard conditions, the measures outlined in the Fire Suppression Contingency Plan will be followed.
Cumulative Effects	Potential effect of multiple projects fragmenting traditional territory, which may have cumulative effects on the environment.	Each project is required to conduct a cumulative effects assessment as part of the Environmental Assessment process

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Cumulative Effects	Cumulative effects to be applied to Aboriginal rights and title	PRGT is required to complete a cumulative effects assessment as part of the EA process. PRGT will follow the approach outlined in EAO's "Guideline for the selection of Valued Components and Assessment of Potential Effects" (September, 2013) for assessing cumulative effects. Section 11 of the Application will include a discussion of potential adverse cumulative effects related to the proposed Project on Aboriginal Interests. To do this, relevant results of the cumulative effects assessment of the valued components will be brought forward and discussed in Section 11.
Environment	Potential disruption of bird habitats at bird sanctuaries such as Bucking House.	The project does not traverse any provincially or federally designated bird sanctuaries. Standard mitigation for reducing project effects on birds and their habitats include: Conduct vegetation clearing outside of the migratory breeding bird window (May 1 to July 31) where feasible. If clearing must occur during the breeding bird window, consult with the appropriate regulatory agency and develop additional mitigation plans. Avoid or reduce impacts to sensitive bird habitats following guidance within legislation and best management practices.
Environment	Potential impact of PRGT pipeline route on small western toad numbers.	Wetlands known to have breeding western toad will be identified and avoided to the extent feasible. If listed or sensitive species are identified during construction of the proposed Project, implement the Wildlife Species of Concern Discovery Contingency Plan. Sightings of sensitive species will be reported to the Environmental Inspectors. Specific protection measures may be implemented and the sighting will be recorded.
Environment	Potential effect of PRGT pipeline route related to acid rock drainage from blasted rock areas.	PRGT will assess potential for acid rock drainage during construction. Where appropriate, site specific mitigation plans will be developed and implemented.
Environment	Potential effects of Project on old growth trees.	Old forests, including Old Growth Management Areas and Wildlife Tree Retention Patches, are included as indicators for the Environmental Assessment. Mitigation measures will include avoidance of old forest to the greatest degree practicable.
Socio-Economic	Interest in maximizing economic participation.	Contracting and employment opportunities will be provided to qualified local and Aboriginal businesses and individuals near the project area.

Category	Potential Adverse Effects	Potential Mitigation Measures – Sample Measures
Water	Potential for water contamination and loss of riparian areas	Develop water quality monitoring plans to monitor for sediment events during instream construction activities, as required by the applicable regulatory approvals (i.e., the DFO Letter of Advice). Install sediment and erosion control measures, where required, Limit clearing of vegetation at watercourse crossings required for vehicle crossing
Water	Potential impact to the quality of fresh water due to sedimentation.	Develop water quality monitoring plans to monitor for sediment events during instream construction activities, as required by the applicable regulatory approvals (i.e., the DFO Letter of Advice).
Water	Potential effect of proposed Pipeline on river crossings	Water course crossings will be designed to minimize potential impacts to the watercourse. Site-specific plans will be developed. Conditions of any approvals or authorizations (e.g., DFO) will be followed.
Wildlife	Potential effect of Project-related accidents on marine wildlife habitat and populations (including killer whales and humpback whales (SARA)).	All marine-based work undertaken by Canadian-registered vessels will comply with the requirements of the <i>Canada Shipping Act</i> . All marine-based work undertaken by foreign vessels will comply with applicable regulations under the International Maritime Organization Conventions including the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL). All marine Project activities will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Canadian Coast Guard Marine Communication and Traffic Services (CCG-MCTS). Scheduling of Project activities will be coordinated through consultation with local fish harvesters and other interest groups, and best efforts will be made to schedule activities to minimize interference with fisheries, other activities and known biological events (e.g., salmon runs, Pacific herring spawning). Vessel maintenance, inspection and certifications will be required before mobilization. Shipboard personnel will be qualified, trained and competent prior to mobilization. All marine equipment used during construction will be examined and cleaned to prevent any control marine bio-fouling. All anti-fouling activities will comply with the Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships and for Dangerous Chemicals (2012), under the <i>Canada Shipping Act</i> , as well as requirements set out by Health Canada and the Pest Management Regulatory Agency regarding approved anti-fouling substances.

10.0 NEXT STEPS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

As the proposed Project moves through the EA process, PRGT will continue to consult Aboriginal groups in accordance with the Order, and guided by the approved Aboriginal Consultation Plan and the outlined next steps specific to each Aboriginal group.

PRGT will continue engage Aboriginal groups openly and transparently, soliciting feedback and reporting back on how their comments and concerns were incorporated into the Application for an EAC and Project design, where appropriate. PRGT will continue consultation activities to understand Aboriginal Interests in the Project area and how the proposed Project may affect Aboriginal Interests, as well as to identify measures to mitigate potential effects.

PRGT will also look to initiate and negotiate Project Agreements with Aboriginal groups, as appropriate, and will seek to provide Aboriginal community members opportunities for achieving effective economic participation in the proposed Project, including employment, training and contracting opportunities.

11.0 GLOSSARY

Abbreviation	Definition
AIUS	Aboriginal Interest Use Study
AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
Aboriginal group	Nisga'a Lisims Government, Treaty 8 First Nations, First Nations and other Aboriginal entities as identified in Schedule B and Schedule C of the Order, as well as Métis
Aboriginal Interest	Asserted or determined aboriginal rights, including title, and treaty rights
BC	British Columbia
bcf/d	Billion cubic feet per day
CCA	Consultation Capacity Agreement
dAIR	Draft Application Information Requirement
EA	Environmental Assessment
EAO	BC Environmental Assessment Office
HDD	Horizontal directional drilling
LOA	Letter of Agreement
m ³ /d	Cubic meters per day
MOE	Ministry of Environment
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
OGC	BC Oil and Gas Commission
the Order	BC EAO Section 11 Order
the Plan	Aboriginal Consultation Plan
PRGT	Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Ltd.
the proposed Project	The Prince Rupert Gas Transmission Project
the Report	Aboriginal Consultation Report
SARA	Species at Risk Act
SCNA	Socio-cultural needs assessment
TEK	Traditional Ecological Knowledge
TLU	Traditional Land Use
TransCanada	TransCanada PipeLines Limited