



# MOUNTMILLIGAN

## Community Sustainability Committee (CSC) Meeting Summary

**Date/Time:** December 9, 2011 **Time:** 10:00 am – 2:00 pm

**Location:** Coast Hotel, Prince George **Date Issued:** December 16, 2011

**Prepared by:** Catherine Rockandel, Rockandel Associates, IAF Certified Professional Facilitator

**Facilitator:** T: 1 (604) 898-4614 E: cat@growpartnerships.com

### Attendees:

Name	Organization	Present (P)
Emily Colombo	Fort St. James, EDO (on holidays Dec 5-	
Brenda Gouglas	District of Fort St. James, Councillor	
Ann McCormick (AM)	College of New Caledonia – Fort St. James	P
Bruce Muir	West Moberly First Nation, Land Use Manager	
Trish Jacques (TJ)	District of Mackenzie, Councillor	P
Diane Smith	District of Mackenzie, EDO	P
Fraser Deacon	Northern Interior Mining Group	
Rosemary Sam	Nak'azdli Band Council, Representative	
Evan Prince	Nak'azdli Band, Natural Resource Worker	
Jenine Solonas	McLeod Lake Indian Band, Councillor	
Kathie LaForge (KLF)	District of Vanderhoof, EDO	P
Dustin Renaud	Initiatives Prince George, Executive Coordinator	
Jocelyn Fraser (JF)	TCRK (did not participate in polls)	P
Wes Carson (WC)	TCRK	P
Scott Morrison	TCRK	
Christy Smith (CS)	TCRK	P

### Distribution: Attendees + Community Sustainability Committee distribution list

Description: Summary of Action Items	Resp.	Due Date	Item
Revise TOR & membership policy based on the input received prior to meeting and adjustments approved in meeting	JF	Dec 12	3
List of seven First Nations for TOR; Action bring forward EA baseline data for next CSC meeting review	CS	Dec 12	3 & 5

### Discussion Items:

#	Topic
1	<p><b>Introduction:</b> Overview of Agenda, Review of Group Agreements,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In advance of the meeting the facilitator circulated the minutes of the teleconference, the detailed agenda that included previous polls, current proposals under discussion, and the revised membership criteria. CSC members were asked to submit questions, comments or concerns prior to the meeting. A total of four emails were sent to ensure members had sufficient notice including: the meeting date, time, call-in number and for notification that materials had been distributed. Some members that were unable to attend responded with positive comments about the membership policy (such as: looks good) and additional questions.</li> <li>CSC members at the last two meetings confirmed that TCM are considered an integral part of the CSC and the TOR should be revised to reflect this. The CSC meeting was comprised of four community participants and two voting TCM members with Jocelyn Fraser attending as a guest and abstaining from voting.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Construction, Environment &amp; Community Relations Update</b></p> <p><i>Construction Presentation: WC</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation included slide show of construction and site photos</li> <li>Is construction on track? Yes</li> <li>Did bid construction out of Vanderhoof bid on work? Don't know</li> </ul> <p><i>Environment Presentation: WC</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation included slide show with photos</li> <li>Westbin is removing waste</li> <li>Bear proof bins are in</li> <li>Load'em up contracting removing waste</li> <li>How are dollars from recycling being distributed? The bottles go to Fort St James bottle depot and they distribute to organizations in Fort St James and individual groups out of Mackenzie.</li> <li>How do we ensure equal access to program and to access dollars, as this process is not broadly known in community? KS: Donation policy will also apply to bottle recycling money. Bottle depot advises people that come from Mt Milligan</li> <li>There is concern in community that some have access and some don't. This policy and process needs to be tightened up. KS: The revised donation policy should do this.</li> <li>Water quality monitoring is happening</li> <li>Fish habitat compensation being constructed</li> <li>Meadow creek pump station under construction</li> <li>Is there going to be more drilling? The plan right now is not to undertake any more drilling until construction is complete</li> </ul> <p><i>Community Relations Update: CS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jody has moved on to a new job as school librarian at her kid's school. We have offers to two people and will inform CSC once person is hired</li> <li>Mackenzie and Fort St James offices are having grand opening in the new year</li> <li>Increase in activity in office - September there were 23 questions, in November there were 118 inquiries. These are primarily work and contract related focusing on jobs and opportunities</li> <li>Operations team is currently 16 people, in February it will be 50 and in July 150</li> <li>TCM have conducted 200+ interviews in last 6 weeks</li> <li>Are these positions in Mackenzie or Fort St James? They are all up on site</li> </ul>

- Community info sessions start in January
- Community investment funding of \$50,000 for Mackenzie and \$50,000 for Fort St James will be announced in next couple of weeks

**3 Terms of Reference: Criteria Review**

- The facilitator reviewed the Gradient of Agreement process used at the September 30<sup>th</sup> CSC meeting and the November 18<sup>th</sup> CSC Teleconference meeting to review and get input on TOR guidelines and membership criteria. The process is as follows:
  1. Read the proposed guideline under discussion, check to see everyone understands the proposal. Discuss previous poll results and comments. If the group is able to confirm a proposal then poll the group again. If the group is unable to confirm a proposal for polling then identify actions to be taken.
  2. Take poll and capture everyone’s position on the scale. The poll is not a decision it is just an indicator of the extent to which the members support the statement or proposal under discussion

**TOR Membership Policy Criteria**

At the November 18<sup>th</sup> CSC teleconference members deferred a final poll on the membership criteria and directed JF to develop a membership policy. The attached membership policy was distributed to members in advance of the Dec 9<sup>th</sup> meeting and it was reviewed paragraph-by-paragraph at the meeting.

**Discussion**

- The criteria states new members can apply, is there an application form? No, there is no application, members recommended revised wording
- There is a reference to seven First Nations? Can we name them? Yes, CS to provide
- What is value of having two CNC reps? What about including UNBC? Discussion that CNC has relationships with school district and UNBC and can represent their perspectives. What about broadening title to Education – CNC? Agreed
- There is a list of founding members, should include West Moberly and Half Way River
- A question submitted in advance of session referred to this section of the minutes: “Prospective new members will be provided the opportunity to be oriented to these Terms of Reference, CSC functioning, and a history of CSC discussions in order to facilitate their ability to become an active member.” Who will be responsible for providing this information to the new members? The CSC members suggested that this should be the role of the facilitator
- Who is going to sit on membership subcommittee? The members suggested that the facilitator should be on the sub-committee. AF, TJ and KLF volunteered to sit on committee as well.

**CSC Membership Policy Poll:**

- 6 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don’t count on my support

**TOR: Area of Focus Criteria**

**Original TOR Criteria:** Environment

**On Line Poll Respondents**

- 3 = I really like it
- 3 = Not perfect but good enough
- 3 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- Discussed concerns raised by members in online poll
- One word allows flexibility and for the term to be all inclusive
- Concerned about leaving it to open needs to be defined
- What about using the first line in the original TOR description?

**Revised Criteria:** The CSC will receive updates about the mine's environmental performance and share information about opportunities and issues related to environmental management at Mount Milligan.

**CSC Member Poll**

- 6 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original TOR Criteria:** Community development to support sustainability via investment in infrastructure, people, or services.

**On Line Poll Respondents**

- 8 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 2 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- Less prescriptive ensures nothing is missed.
- If we name things like gambling, addictions, mental health issues, alcohol related charges such as DUI's etc., the increases may be attributed to the social impact of the mine or may also be attributed to other factors such as more people per capita so the rate is same, or more police officers targeting drinking under the influence.
- Concern about having just the word sustainable as this implies we are sustaining things as they are. The purpose of the CSC is to leave things better after the mine is complete. What about saying "support sustainable growth"?

**Revised Criteria:** Community development to support sustainable growth via investment in infrastructure, people, or services.

**CSC Member Poll**

- 6 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**TOR: Meeting Schedule Criteria**

**Original Meeting Schedule Criteria:** Meetings will be scheduled quarterly or more frequently if required, with the next meeting date scheduled at each CSC meeting with the members who are present.

**On Line Poll Respondents**

- 9 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 1 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- Several questions submitted in advance were discussed including: Why are the focus area titles in the membership criteria and TOR not the same? A CSC member at the meeting also raised this issue. This was an oversight and will be corrected
- If we need to call a meeting in between meetings, because of an issue that has arisen, how would we go about that? The members present discussed and suggested that, if an issue comes up the facilitator will flag issue – poll members and determine from responses whether a teleconference or in person meeting is required, and/or whether issue can be added to next agenda

**Revised Meeting Criteria:** Meetings will be scheduled quarterly, or more frequently if required, with the next meeting date scheduled at each CSC meeting with the members who are present.

Should an issue arise that requires attention before a regularly scheduled meeting, the member with concerns will contact the facilitator. S/he will poll members for group consensus on the need for a special meeting. If the membership does not feel a meeting is required, the item will be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

**CSC Member Poll**

- 6 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original Meeting Schedule Criteria:** Meetings will be convened and conducted by an external and independent third party facilitator. The secretarial functions of the panel (administration, minute keeping and meeting report preparation) will be arranged by the facilitator

**On Line Poll Respondents**

- 8 = I really like it
- 1 = Not perfect but good enough
- 1 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- One of the members present identified that they had made the comment: "I liked the earlier format of the meetings better when Terrane organized the meetings. I think having a facilitator for formalizing the Terms of Reference for the Committee has been useful but maybe not necessary as we move forward."
- The facilitator probed what the member liked about the previous meeting. It was suggested that the learning that comes from members sharing what is happening in

their communities is valuable. Members suggested that the CSC forum is one of the few places they have to connect with other community members to hear what is going on.

- It was suggested that once the TOR is completed then more time on the agenda for updates would be scheduled.

**Revised Meeting Criteria:** In addition to the original criteria, the following text will be added: "The desire to continue with a facilitator will be reviewed on an annual basis."

**CSC Member Poll**

- 4 = I really like it
- 2 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original Meeting Schedule Criteria:** Agenda topics will be determined by the facilitator in consultation with community members and TCM

**On Line Poll Respondents**

- 7 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 3 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- As with previous comments - use just CSC since TCM is a member.
- Members suggested wording change to "compiled by" rather than determined by and "following" rather than in consultation.

**Revised Meeting Criteria:** Agenda topics will be compiled by the facilitator following consultation with CSC members

**CSC Member Poll**

- 4 = I really like it
- 2 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original Meeting Schedule Criteria:** Minutes summarizing the discussion of each meeting will be prepared and reviewed for accuracy. Viewpoints of individual members will not be attributed to them. The meetings will be structured to encourage free and open discussion of relevant issues, within the constraints of planned agendas. The goal is not to seek consensus or majority opinion, but to discuss and note views and opinions.

**On Line Poll Respondents**

- 7 = I really like it
- 1 = Not perfect but good enough
- 1 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Revised Criteria:** Summaries of each meeting will be prepared and reviewed for accuracy. Viewpoints of individual members will not be attributed to them. The meetings will be structured to encourage free and open discussion of relevant issues, within the constraints of planned agendas. The goal is not to seek consensus or majority opinion, but to discuss and note views and opinions.

**CSC Member Poll**

- 3 = I really like it
- 3 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Original Meeting Schedule Criteria** Invitations to guests for attending CSC meetings by community panel members will be done through prior arrangement with the facilitator. Guests are requested to observe rather than participate directly in the CSC discussions. Issues or questions they might wish raised that are new and appropriate must be addressed either through the person who invited them or separate from the CSC meeting. The intention is to maintain a process that ensures that the CSC meeting time is used to accomplish the agenda developed for that meeting. Typically, the meetings will be closed to media.

**On Line Poll Respondents**

- 5 = I really like it
- 4 = Not perfect but good enough
- 1 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

**Discussion**

- Focused on need for other statements in criteria. Suggested that only first sentence was needed.

**Revised Criteria:** Invitations for guests to attend CSC meetings will be agreed to by the CSC and extended by the facilitator.

**CSC Member Poll**

- 6 = I really like it
- 0 = Not perfect but good enough
- 0 = More discussion needed
- 0 = Serious disagreement, don't count on my support

4

**Donation Policy Evaluation Review**

CS presented and reviewed the Donations Policy Application Form and the Donations Policy Evaluation Process (attached with minutes).

Q&A included:

- Regional reach to ensure double dipping does not occur with people applying to TCM's Endako Mine as well
- Is there a deadline for quarterly calls? No, first come first serve
- Donation form could it include a box to indicate what quarter application is for. Yes
- Could evaluation form be attached with application so people know how their application is being ranked, this would support transparency? Yes
- What is a special interest group as defined on form? It is a single issue constituency group that coalesces around opposition to a particular organization, project or issue

	<p>such as resource company project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested that it is best to take this reference out “advocacy or special interest group”. Agreed</li> <li>• Can we include a box on application form that asks if applicant has received funding before yes or no? Agreed we can</li> <li>• Use full language no acronyms</li> <li>• Can we include a box that asks are you applying for other funding yes or no? Good idea</li> <li>• TCM creating a report that lists applications to Mt Milligan and Endako Mine in 2012</li> <li>• What about instances like a swim group that applies for funding to support group and for a banner. Does that application go through donations policy or through PR because it is more like advertising? It depends on the nature of the application and would be determined case-by-case</li> <li>• The donations policy will posted in January 2012 through newspaper, e-news and website</li> <li>• Could TCM also post projects that are supported through website – yes</li> </ul>
5	<p><b>Corporate Social Responsibility Report Presentation</b></p> <p>JF presented and reviewed the draft CSR report table of contents in development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General feedback was this sounds like a good approach</li> <li>• We provided baseline data will this be integrated into the report –</li> <li>• Fort St James community group initiative is monitoring impact pre and post mine. This is being led by Janis Shandro, funding is through her thesis grants. Where did this committee come from? It emerged from Nak’azdli’s concern about impacts.</li> <li>• Was it a requirement of Environmental Assessment (EA) to report on indicators in Mackenzie and Fort St James such as employment, wages, demographics, social impacts, crime? Need to clarify exactly what was expectation of EA</li> <li>• What about the CSC doing its own research? Isn’t that what we are here for? Where would CSC get the funding? It is not necessarily direct relationship to mine and so not part of funding? CSC would need funding to hire someone to sort through data. For example health authority data groups all communities together</li> <li>• Wasn’t baseline assessment done for EA? Yes, can this be put into spreadsheet, not sure who would do this and where the funding would come from?</li> <li>• What if we were to choose a couple of stats- not all stats and use them as a baseline to ask questions and explore a particular issue? One suggestion was crime</li> </ul> <p>Action: bring forward EA baseline data for next CSC meeting review</p>
6	<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Celebrated the completion of the Terms of Reference Criteria and the Membership Policy review.</li> <li>• Discussed the date of the next meeting March 9 or 16<sup>th</sup> in PG. March 16<sup>th</sup> would be better because PDAC is March 4-7in Toronto</li> </ul>