

**ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION SPRINGBANK OFF-STREAM RESERVOIR PROJECT
RESPONSE TO NRCB AND AEP SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REQUEST 1, JULY 28, 2018**

Appendix IR153-1 Consolidated Record of Consultation Logs and Specific Concerns and Response Tables
for Treaty 7 Nations
May 2019

**APPENDIX IR153-1 CONSOLIDATED RECORD OF
CONSULTATION LOGS AND SPECIFIC
CONCERNS AND RESPONSE TABLES FOR
TREATY 7 NATIONS**

**ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION SPRINGBANK OFF-STREAM RESERVOIR PROJECT
RESPONSE TO NRCB AND AEP SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REQUEST 1, JULY 28, 2018**

Appendix IR153-1 Consolidated Record of Consultation Logs and Specific Concerns and Response Tables
for Treaty 7 Nations
May 2019

Springbank SR1 - Specific Concerns and Response Table

First Nation or Metis Settlement: **BLOOD TRIBE/KAINAI**

Date: **AUGUST 2014 – FEBRUARY 2019**

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
1	<p>January 5, 2018 Letter from JFK Law Corporation to Deputy Minister Barry Day on behalf of the Blood Tribe/Kainai</p> <p>June 25, 2018 Letter from JFK Law Corporation to DEMA Land Services</p> <p>June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank EIS Technical comments – Ermineskin Cree Nation and Blood Tribe.</i></p>	<p>Impacts to water</p> <p>Impacts to health</p> <p>Impacts to traditional territory</p> <p>Aboriginal rights</p> <p>Treaty rights</p>	<p>Transportation has not made adequate efforts to obtain information about: an assessment of country foods relied upon by the Blood Tribe/Kainai; traditional territory of Blood Tribe/Kainai; impacts to drinking water and recreational waters by Blood Tribe/Kainai; and potential health and socio-economic effects of the project on Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>The proponent has failed to adequately assess the impacts to the current use of lands for traditional purposes and potential impacts to the Blood Tribe/Kainai's rights.</p> <p>The proponent has failed to understand the scope of Treaty rights held by the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>No meaningful efforts have been made to gather information from the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>Proponent has failed to gather baseline information regarding the location of lands which the Blood Tribe/Kainai access to exercise Treaty rights.</p>	<p>In a letter dated January 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the timelines for the EIA submission, indicating that the timelines had been extended by 60 days to undertake further Indigenous engagement activities. Alberta Transportation also proposed a workshop to discuss traditional land and resource use (TLRU) and obtain feedback from the Blood Tribe/Kainai. Alberta Transportation also welcomed written feedback on the updated Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B), which were provided February 5, 2018.</p> <p>In a letter dated January 29, 2018, Alberta Justice responded to the January 5, 2018 letter, referencing the January 26, 2018 letter and Alberta Transportation's offer to hold a workshop.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation has been engaged with the Indigenous groups since 2014 to understand how the Project potentially impacts rights, interests and traditional uses including offering and funding site visits and TUS studies.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation funded and provided the opportunity for the Blood Tribe/Kainai to visit the site. Nation members visited the site on 13 days.</p> <p>An interim TUS report was delivered by the Blood Tribe/Kainai on March 13, 2017. The TUS study was used in the EIA. However, Permission to use the spatial information from the TUS study has not been received by Alberta Transportation, therefore the information regarding sites and areas has been generalized for use in the EIA and exact locations, including those in the project development area, are not provided.</p> <p>The potential effects to country foods, drinking water and health have been assessed within the EIA, and were included in the draft TLRU section (Volumes 3A and 3B) sent to Blood Tribe/Kainai for review and comment on February 5, 2018. Effects to socioeconomic conditions have been included in this EIA.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation offered a workshop with Blood Tribe/Kainai to better understand how the project potentially impacts Blood Tribe/Kainai and is awaiting on a suitable date to meet.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent a letter dated January 28, 2019 that requested the Blood Tribe/Kainai's provide its views and perspectives on its Aboriginal and Treaty rights, cultural and experiential values, and country foods. The letter listed four specific topics that Alberta Transportation was requesting input on to help answer Canadian Environmental Assessment</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to providing written responses to the Blood Tribe/Kainai's submissions to CEAA.</p> <p>As of February 28, 2019, Alberta Transportation has not provided this response; however, it will be forthcoming in 2019.</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				Agency (CEAA) IR2-01, IR2-02, and IR2-08. As of February 28, 2019, the Blood Tribe/Kainai has not provided a response.			
2	November 25, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held with Mike Oka, Blood Tribe/Kainai Consultation Coordinator, Stand Off Alberta.	Traditional Knowledge Medicinal Plants	The Blood Tribe/Kainai indicated that they would like to see the EIA and a traditional knowledge study done at the same time. The Blood Tribe/Kainai indicated they would like to complete a Traditional Use Study (TUS) of the SR1 Project Area. The Blood Tribe/Kainai wanted to have their Elders involved when medicinal plants and traditional knowledge is being assessed.	Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Blood Tribe/Kainai to conduct a TUS on the project lands (privately and publicly held). Blood Tribe/Kainai conducted a TUS (14 field days) in summer/fall of 2016. The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim TUS Report on March 13, 2017 that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Kainai First Nation to conduct a TUS on the project lands. An interim report was delivered by the Kainai First Nation in March 2017. The TUS study was used in the EIA.	At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, the Blood Tribe/Kainai expressed displeasure that their knowledge holders were not included in the environmental impact studies. At the meeting held on January 18, 2017 meeting, the Blood Tribe/Kainai stated that their TUS is not the same as a traditional knowledge study, and that they would like to do this if funding was provided.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
3	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018. June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank EIS Technical comments – Ermineskin Cree Nation and Blood Tribe</i> June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.	Traditional use	Clarify how TLRU information was incorporated into the analysis of effects. TUS reports for all First Nations should be incorporated into the baseline report and effects assessment. Incorporate information from recent Traditional Land Use report submitted by the Blood Tribe/Kainai. Project-specific information on Blood Tribe/Kainai TLRU is too narrow to make the assessment valid. Lack of historical context on the nature of Blood Tribe/Kainai's connection to the project areas.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
4	August 7, 2018 Meeting between the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Traditional use	The Blood Tribe/Kainai do not agree with how traditional use has been assessed in the EIA.	At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to providing written responses to the Blood Tribe/Kainai's submissions to CEAA, including the traditional use information in the <i>Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> report.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation As of February 28, 2019, Alberta Transportation has not provided this response; however, it will be forthcoming in 2019.

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
5	June 25, 2018 Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018	Traditional use	The Proponent should negotiate with Blood Tribe/Kainai to provide resources and reasonable timelines to gather an adequate baseline of Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge Use (TKU) in the Project areas and produce a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts and a determination of significance. Upon completion of the community-based assessment of potential impacts to Blood Tribe/Kainai TKU, the Proponent should meet with Blood Tribe/Kainai representatives to discuss concerns and address potential mitigation and compensation measures as recommended by the report.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
6	November 25, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held with Mike Oka, Blood Tribe/Kainai Consultation Coordinator, Stand Off Alberta. May 16, 2016 Blood Tribe/Kainai Letter to Alberta Transportation (DEMA) in support of their TUS budget request.	Traditional Knowledge Confidentiality	Blood Tribe/Kainai were concerned that if they share traditional knowledge with the Crown on SR1 they may lose ownership of that information. Concerns expressed over how the traditional knowledge the Blood Tribe/Kainai Elders or technicians provide will be used, and that the knowledge needs to be protected.	At the meeting held on January 18, 2017 meeting, Stantec stated that they could include input on traditional ecological knowledge and land use into the EIA and report Indigenous findings subject to confidentiality issues. In an email to the Blood Tribe/Kainai on January 30, 2017, Alberta Transportation stated they will accept an abbreviated TUS rather than the full report, if the Blood Tribe/Kainai would prefer to keep some knowledge internal. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: A joint interim TUS report was delivered by Kainai and Siksika First Nations in March 2017. The TUS study was used in the EIA. However, permission to use the spatial information from the TUS study has not been received by Alberta Transportation, therefore the information regarding sites and areas has been generalized for use in the EIA and exact locations, including those in the project development area, are not provided.	At the meeting held on January 18, 2017 meeting, the Blood Tribe/Kainai responded to Stantec that this was a start, and better communication about traditional knowledge was needed.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
7	September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump	Traditional Territory	The Blood Tribe/Kainai questioned the additional indigenous groups that had been included in the CEAA guidelines, as historically this area was Blackfoot territory.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The list of Indigenous groups required for engagement on the Project was provided to Alberta Transportation by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA).	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation.

1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
<p>November 25, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held with Mike Oka, Blood Tribe/Kainai Consultation Coordinator, Stand Off Alberta.</p> <p>July 11-14, 2016 Site Visits</p> <p>September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump</p> <p>January 18, 2017 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta.</p> <p>January 31, 2017 Email from Blood Tribe/Kainai to DEMA</p> <p>March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation</p>	<p>Historical Resources</p>	<p>If tipi rings are disturbed by SR1 they will have no meaning.</p> <p>Construction of SR1 may disturb historical resources.</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai Elders and Technicians on inspection of Property #21 along the "unnamed creek" identified what they believed to be tipi rings on the north side of the unnamed creek.</p> <p>Blood Tribe/Kainai expressed concern that the tipi rings are potentially located adjacent to the SR1 reservoir outfall along an unnamed creek into the Elbow River.</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai Elders and consultation technicians re-inspected the areas on SR1 properties #4, #21, and #24. The area of most interest was near the dry reservoir in locations that they identified as a wintering ground with many tipi rings.</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai are concerned the evidence of these wintering grounds and tipi rings will be lost if this area is excavated for the SR1 outfall to drain the dry reservoir after a flood event.</p> <p>Blood Tribe/Kainai Elders and Technicians re-visited Property #1 and walked around the old Stoney (North South) Trail.</p> <p>Concerns expressed about how construction might impact former campsites, which include tipi rings and other cultural artifacts from Blackfoot history.</p> <p>Concerns were raised related to impacts on cultural sites by the SR1 during and after construction.</p>	<p>In an email on January 7, 2017, Alberta Transportation requested the Blood Tribe/Kainai's TUS prior to the January 18, 2017 meeting, so they could review any detailed site-specific concerns and be prepared to discuss potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation brought Stantec (Alberta Transportation's consultant) to the January 18, 2017 meeting to share information on their EIA field data collection program and methodologies and to gain an understanding of the traditional knowledge and traditional uses component required in the EIA.</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim TUS Report on March 13, 2017 that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation. Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017, and indicated that cultural and historical resource concerns had been forwarded to Alberta Culture and Tourism (ACT). Also stated that concerns from the TUS would be incorporated into and addressed in the EIA.</p> <p>The TUS report was used to inform the TLRU sections of the EIA (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Alberta Transportation responded to the Blood Tribe/Kainai's March 13, 2017 TUS in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Alberta Transportation forwarded the concerns to ACT, and ACT's Treaty 7 contact would be able to discuss the concerns further.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Project activities within the project development area would disturb 11 precontact period and 11 historic period archaeological sites. No traditional land use sites of very high heritage value, such as spiritual sites or human burials, have been identified within the project development area. Identified sites include isolated finds, artifact scatters, campsites and historic remains such as homesteads and a school. Effects to historical resources are detailed in the EIA, Volume 3A and 3B, section 13.</p> <p>ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to cross reference the sites in the Blood Tribe/Kainai's June 2018 TUS and those identified in the Historical Resources Impact Assessment (HRIA); to confirm the risks to these sites; and propose possible mitigation measures for these sites. Alberta Transportation has committed to overlay the GPS coordinates with the PDA to determine sites at risk.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017 the Blood Tribe/Kainai explained that traditional knowledge is different from traditional use. Blood Tribe/Kainai has not participated in Traditional Knowledge as of yet. They need to be on the ground with the people doing the assessment as it is hard to incorporate Traditional Knowledge into the report. Traditional Use has been assessed and a report is being drafted.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Blood Tribe/Kainai remain concerned about cultural sites and features, and how these sites will be protected and/or mitigated. In Blood Tribe/Kainai's view, Alberta Transportation's response of following all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT is not adequate.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, the Blood Tribe/Kainai committed to providing Alberta Transportation with the GPS coordinates for the sites identified in their June 2018 TUS.</p> <p>As of February 28, 2019, the Blood Tribe/Kainai has not provided the GPS data.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai expressed concern about their history being erased due to growth and development in the province, and how will this be accommodated.</p> <p>Expressed concerns related to ceremonial locations and impacts to Blackfoot cultural sites.</p>	<p>In emails sent September 28, 2018 and November 14, 2018, and in a letter from Alberta Justice to Blood Tribe/Kainai's legal counsel dated February 7, 2019 Alberta Transportation requested the GPS data again.</p>			
8	<p>May 16, 2016</p> <p>Blood Tribe/Kainai Letter to Alberta Transportation (DEMA) in support of their TUS budget request.</p>	<p>Historical Resources</p> <p>Flood Debris</p>	<p>Concerns were expressed about debris and sediment that may be left in the reservoir after a flood, which would cover evidence of Blackfoot people being there.</p>	<p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim TUS Report on March 13, 2017 that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation. Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017, and indicated that cultural and historical resource concerns had been forwarded to Alberta Culture and Tourism (ACT). Also stated that concerns from the TUS would be incorporated into and addressed in the EIA.</p> <p>The TUS report was used to inform the TLRU sections of the EIA (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: It is anticipated that sediment and debris will enter the reservoir area during a flood. The volume of sediment and debris will depend upon the size of the flood. Debris that has the potential to affect the functioning of the reservoir will be removed after a flood event. ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to cross reference the sites in the Blood Tribe/Kainai's June 2018 TUS and those identified in the HRIA; to confirm the risks to these sites; and propose possible mitigation measures for these sites. Alberta Transportation has committed to overlay the GPS coordinates with the PDA to determine sites at risk.</p> <p>In emails sent September 28, 2018 and November 14, 2018, and in a letter from Alberta Justice to Blood Tribe/Kainai's legal counsel dated February 7, 2019 Alberta Transportation requested the GPS data again.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Blood Tribe/Kainai remain concerned about cultural sites and features, and how these sites will be protected and/or mitigated. In Blood Tribe/Kainai's view, Alberta Transportation's response of following all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT is not adequate.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, the Blood Tribe/Kainai committed to providing Alberta Transportation with the GPS coordinates for the sites identified in their June 2018 TUS.</p> <p>As of February 28, 2019, the Blood Tribe/Kainai has not provided the GPS data.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
9	<p>May 16, 2016</p> <p>Blood Tribe/Kainai Letter to Alberta Transportation (DEMA) in support of their TUS budget request.</p>	<p>Historical Resources</p> <p>Medicinal Plants</p>	<p>Concerns expressed on the loss of cultural sites such as tipi rings, effigies of different sorts, medicinal plants.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Project activities within the project development area would disturb 11 precontact period and 11 historic period archaeological sites. No traditional land use sites of very high heritage value, such as</p>	<p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Blood Tribe/Kainai remain concerned about cultural sites and features, and how these sites will be protected and/or mitigated. In Blood Tribe/Kainai's view, Alberta Transportation's response of</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	June 27 – July 1, 2016 Site Visits		<p>During a visit to Property #1 (June 28, 2016), the landowner showed the Blood Tribe/Kainai Elders the First Nation's Trail (North South Trail), and discussed medicinal value of some of the plants on the property. The landowner also showed the Elders the location of an old campsite for First Nations travelling along the Trail.</p>	<p>spiritual sites or human burials, have been identified within the project development area. Identified sites include isolated finds, artifact scatters, campsites and historic remains such as homesteads and a school. Effects to historical resources are detailed in the EIA, Volume 3A and 3B, section 13.</p> <p>ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>Vegetation will be cleared from the project development area during construction. However, effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in the loss of traditionally used species in the local assessment area. The effects on plants and traditional use are assessed in the EIA in Volume 3A and 3B, sections 10 and 14.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation would provide opportunities for harvesting or relocating medicinal and ceremonial plants prior to construction.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to cross reference the sites in the Blood Tribe/Kainai's June 2018 TUS and those identified in the HRIA; to confirm the risks to these sites; and propose possible mitigation measures for these sites. Alberta Transportation has committed to overlay the GPS coordinates with the PDA to determine sites at risk.</p> <p>In emails sent September 28, 2018 and November 14, 2018, and in a letter from Alberta Justice to Blood Tribe/Kainai's legal counsel dated February 7, 2019 Alberta Transportation requested the GPS data again.</p>	<p>following all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT is not adequate.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, the Blood Tribe/Kainai committed to providing Alberta Transportation with the GPS coordinates for the sites identified in their June 2018 TUS.</p> <p>As of February 28, 2019, the Blood Tribe/Kainai has not provided the GPS data.</p>		
10	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank EIS Technical comments – Ermineskin Cree Nation and Blood Tribe.</i>	Historic resources	Risks and impacts to cultural heritage sites is not clear, and mitigation measures do not provide substantive information.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
11	June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.	Historical resources Cultural sites	<p>Effects to sites of archaeological, historical, spiritual, ceremonial, and cultural importance within the project area, as well as loss of access to these sites. These sites include traditional Blackfoot camps and trails. Anything short of avoidance would not be effective mitigation.</p> <p>Absence of maps depicting location of sites of potential historical, archaeological, or cultural interest to Blood</p>	<p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to cross reference the sites in the Blood Tribe/Kainai's June 2018 TUS and those identified in the HRIA; to confirm the risks to these sites; and propose possible mitigation measures for these sites. Alberta Transportation has committed to overlay the GPS coordinates with the PDA to determine sites at risk.</p> <p>In emails sent September 28, 2018 and November 14, 2018, and in a letter from Alberta Justice to Blood Tribe/Kainai's legal counsel dated February 7, 2019 Alberta Transportation requested the GPS data again.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, the Blood Tribe/Kainai committed to providing Alberta Transportation with the GPS coordinates for the sites identified in their June 2018 TUS.</p> <p>As of February 28, 2019, the Blood Tribe/Kainai has not provided the GPS data.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>Tribe/Kainai's current use of the lands.</p> <p>Recommendation: Develop avoidance or redesign measures to ensure Blood Tribe/Kainai cultural properties, ceremonial sites, and identified traditional camping areas and associated material features remain intact and accessible.</p>				
12	<p>November 25, 2014</p> <p>Initial SR1 Meeting held with Mike Oka, Blood Tribe/Kainai Consultation Coordinator, Stand Off Alberta.</p>	Human remains	Construction of SR1 may disturb human remains.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Should any chance find of human remains be made during construction, all construction will immediately cease in the area, the site will be secured and all provincial regulations regarding the chance find of human remains will be followed.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
13	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>Email exchange between Blood Tribe/Kainai and DEMA</p>	Historical Resources	<p>Blood Tribe/Kainai stated that the Department of Transportation should begin to think about mitigation measures for the loss of sites within SR1, which would be lost in the first big flood.</p>	<p>The issue of mitigation measures was added to the January 18, 2017 meeting agenda. The meeting agenda was sent to the Blood Tribe/Kainai for review on January 16, 2017.</p> <p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Alberta Transportation stated that once they received the TUS and the site-specific concerns their experts can start working on potential mitigation.</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim TUS Report on March 13, 2017 that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation. The TUS was used to inform the TLRU sections of the EIA (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Project activities within the project development area would disturb 11 precontact period and 11 historic period archaeological sites. No traditional land use sites of very high heritage value, such as spiritual sites or human burials have been identified within the project development area. Identified sites include isolated finds, artifact scatters, campsites and historic remains such as homesteads and a school. Effects to historical resources are detailed in the EIA, Volume 3A and 3B, section 13.</p> <p>ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to cross reference the sites in the Blood Tribe/Kainai's June 2018 TUS</p>	<p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Blood Tribe/Kainai remain concerned about cultural sites and features, and how these sites will be protected and/or mitigated. In Blood Tribe/Kainai's view, Alberta Transportation's response of following all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT is not adequate.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, the Blood Tribe/Kainai committed to providing Alberta Transportation with the GPS coordinates for the sites identified in their June 2018 TUS.</p> <p>As of February 28, 2019, the Blood Tribe/Kainai has not provided the GPS data.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>and those identified in the HRIA; to confirm the risks to these sites; and propose possible mitigation measures for these sites. Alberta Transportation has committed to overlay the GPS coordinates with the PDA to determine sites at risk.</p> <p>In emails sent September 28, 2018 and November 14, 2018, and in a letter from Alberta Justice to Blood Tribe/Kainai's legal counsel dated February 7, 2019 Alberta Transportation requested the GPS data again.</p>			
14	<p>September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump January 18, 2017 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta. March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation</p>	<p>Information sharing Historical Resources</p>	<p>Blood Tribe/Kainai requested archaeological information gathered during the SR-1 site investigations be shared with the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>Lack of sharing archaeological data for SR1 is a concern.</p> <p>Requested Historical Resources Impact Assessment (HRIA) and archaeological information.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that the impacts to historical resources is under ACT's jurisdiction, and Stantec/Alberta Transportation are not able to provide that information at this time. Requests for the archaeological studies would have to go through ACT. Should ACT approve the request for the information, Alberta Transportation could then share it.</p> <p>In a letter dated May 10, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated they had forwarded Blood Tribe/Kainai's archaeological concerns to ACT, and the Treaty 7 contact would be available to them to discuss their concerns.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation is not authorized to disclose the information requested directly to the Blood Tribe/Kainai. Alberta Transportation contacted ACT and obtained the Treaty 7 representative contact details and passed those details to the Blood Tribe/Kainai. The Blood Tribe/Kainai can make their request for the information directly to this individual.</p> <p>In an email on August 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided the contact information for the Treaty 7 contact at ACT again.</p>	<p>In an email on August 21, 2018, the Blood Tribe/Kainai requested the HRIA from ACT.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation cannot provide the requested information. Alberta Transportation provided the contact information for the Treaty 7 contact at ACT to whom the Blood Tribe/Kainai can make the request.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
15	<p>March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation</p>	<p>Historical resources</p>	<p>Desire to further study Blackfoot Traditional Camp Site in creek valley. A joint archaeological and TUS should be undertaken of the creek valley to identify possible burial sites.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
16	<p>March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation</p>	<p>Historical resources Traditional use</p>	<p>Due to likelihood that there are Blackfoot traditional use and cultural sites throughout the creek valley, it is suggested that the natural creek channel should not be used as an outflow channel.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
17	<p>September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation,</p>	<p>Wildlife Vegetation Information sharing</p>	<p>Blood Tribe/Kainai requested information on Species at Risk (Wildlife and Plants) gathered during the SR-1 investigations</p>	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Blood Tribe/Kainai (Plant and Wildlife Species at Risk) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump			On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Twenty-six species of management concern, including 15 birds and 11 mammals were observed during wildlife field surveys between 2015 and 2017. No plant species at risk were recorded during field surveys. Results of the field work are provided in the EIA; Volume 4, Appendix H and L, and Vol 3A sections 10 and 11.			
18	January 18, 2017 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta	Wildlife	Concerns expressed on SR1 construction impact to animal homes, such as the beavers.	Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Blood Tribe/Kainai (wildlife) will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: No beaver dams were identified during surveys conducted for the Project. It is not anticipated that the Project would affect beaver dams. In the event of a flood, effects to beaver dams may occur whether the Project is in place or not. The effects of the Project to wildlife and aquatic species are discussed in the EIA Volumes 3A and 3B, sections 8 and 11.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
19	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife Traditional use	Provide regional data and traditional use data as context for the baseline study results for elk. Potential for project to influence elk movement patterns. Justify the 250 metre and 500 metre road buffers for elk. More detail needed regarding population trends and threats to elk. Justify why a 15 kilometre buffer of the project area was chosen for the RAA for wildlife.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
20	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife	Location of remote cameras not provided.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
21	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and</i>	Wildlife	Explain why elevation and aspect was not included in the grizzly bear habitat suitability model.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<i>Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.		Explain why a 500 metre buffer of industrial developments was used in the grizzly bear habitat suitability model. Clarify why average home range for female grizzly bear was chosen as the RAA for vegetation and wetlands.				
22	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife habitat	Recommend a habitat compensation plan be developed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
23	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife	Provide details on monitoring program to monitor project effects on wildlife.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
24	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife	Concerned that the conclusion of significance is discussed at a high level for wildlife and is not done for each species. Definition of significance should include wildlife habitat and biodiversity. Summary of the wildlife and biodiversity cumulative effects needed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
25	<p>June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank EIS Technical comments – Ermineskin Cree Nation and Blood Tribe.</i></p> <p>June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.</p> <p>June 25, 2018 Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018</p>	<p>Wildlife</p> <p>Hunting</p>	<p>Concerns regarding assessment of wildlife, especially elk, upon which the Blood Tribe/Kainai depend for hunting.</p> <p>Concerns regarding wildlife, including those that are hunted in the project area.</p> <p>Loss of use of high quality hunting area and bird hunting area.</p> <p>Prior to construction of the Project, the Proponent should invite Blood Tribe/Kainai land users to hunt in the PDA, particularly for big game such as moose, elk, and deer.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
26	<p>June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.</p>	Birds	<p>Explain using a seven day window for conducting a nest survey.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
27	<p>October 29, 2018 Blood Tribe/Kainai Government Open House</p>	<p>Fish</p> <p>Wildlife</p>	Effects to fish and wildlife.	<p>At the open house held on October 29, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed the effects to fish and wildlife, including: wildlife friendly fencing; having vegetated 3:1 slopes; a fish rescue program to collect stranded fish; etc..</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
28	<p>September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump</p>	<p>Fish</p> <p>Fish habitat</p> <p>Information sharing</p>	<p>Blood Tribe/Kainai requested impact information on fish and fish habitat resulting from the SR-1 project</p>	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Blood Tribe/Kainai (fish, fish habitat) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in the permanent loss of 1,854 m² fish habitat at the diversion structure. This area has been identified as suitable foraging habitat for trout including, mountain whitefish, brown trout and rainbow trout. The area that will be lost is small compared to the habitat available within the local assessment area, which is approximately 3,100,000 m². Given the limited extent of the habitat affected impacts to fish and fish habitat are predicted to be not significant. The assessment of effects to fish and fish habitat are provided in the EIA Volumes 3A and 3B, section 8.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
29	September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump	Fish	Blood Tribe/Kainai requested information on how the design of the SR1 is being undertaken to ensure that during a flood/drain event that the mortality of fish is limited.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: After a flood, the water flows in the diversion channel will be gradually reduced and the reservoir slowly drained to facilitate the movement of fish from the reservoir, back to the Elbow River with the receding water. The outlet will be designed and operated in a manner that allows fish egress out of the reservoir, downstream into the outlet channel. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish during release of stored flood water from the reservoir. During draining of the reservoir, monitoring will be undertaken to identify isolated pools and the potential that fish may become stranded. If potential fish stranding is identified, a fish rescue program will be undertaken to return the fish to the river.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
30	March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.	Medicinal and Ceremonial Plants	Concerns expressed on the potential impact to medicinal and ceremonial plants. Stated that these will need to be protected or relocated. Concerns regarding plants, including those used for medicinal purposes, within the project area.	Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Blood Tribe/Kainai about impacts to medicinal and ceremonial plants will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Vegetation will be cleared from the project development area during construction. However, effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in the loss of traditionally used species in the local assessment area. The effects on plants and traditional use are assessed in the EIA in Volume 3A and 3B, sections 10 and 14. Alberta Transportation would provide opportunities for harvesting or relocating medicinal and ceremonial plants prior to construction.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
31	June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018. June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Vegetation Medicinal and Ceremonial plants	Loss of access to high quality natural prairie grassland, mixed wood and coniferous forests, and wetlands that are suitable for medicinal and food plant gathering. Clarify the claim that native plant communities may be altered but areas would not be lost as a result of filling and draining the reservoir. Long term loss of traditional use plants in flooded areas not considered. Justify assessment of potential loss of rare plants.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
32	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Vegetation	Planting native shrub and tree species should be considered to mitigate the change in species diversity and loss of native vegetation communities. Mitigation should include developing management plan to prevent spread of regulated weeds.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
33	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Vegetation	Provide an invasive species management plan.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
34	June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.	Landscapes Vegetation	Destruction of the landscape. Destruction of old growth forests within the PDA.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
35	June 25, 2018 Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018	Medicinal plants	Prior to the construction of the Project, the Proponent should invite Blood Tribe/Kainai land users to harvest medicinal plants in the PDA, particularly along the river.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Vegetation will be cleared from the project development area during construction. However, effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in the loss of traditionally used species in the LAA. The effects on plants and traditional use are assessed in the EIA in Volume 3A and 3B, sections 10 and 14. Alberta Transportation would provide opportunities for harvesting or relocating medicinal and ceremonial plants prior to construction.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
36	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Vegetation Wetlands	Confirm if a monitoring plan for post-construction and post-flood conditions will be developed to monitor reclaimed areas (vegetation and wetlands).	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
37	March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim	Wetlands (sloughs)	Concerns expressed related to the protection of off-river sloughs as animals and fish in	Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Blood Tribe/Kainai about off-river sloughs will be addressed as part of the EIA.	None at this time.	None at this time	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.		and around the Elbow River rely on the sloughs. Concerns regarding wetlands and natural meadows within the PDA.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project would result in the loss of 8 ha of estimated high value wetland area and 13 ha of moderate wetland area in the local assessment area. Approximately 312 ha of the local assessment area contains wetland cover types. No vegetation and wetland land units are completely lost, and therefore no significant effects on vegetation and wetlands are predicted. <i>Water Act</i> approval would be obtained for disturbances to wetlands before construction, and permanent disturbance to wetlands would be replaced in accordance with the <i>Alberta Wetland Policy</i> . Effects to wetlands are assessed in the EIA in Volumes 3A and 3B section 10.			
38	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Wetlands	How is direct/indirect loss or alteration of surface or groundwater flow patterns being measured with respect to wetland function?	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
39	March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation	Upstream/downstream effects.	Concerns expressed related to impact on upstream and downstream effects.	Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Blood Tribe/Kainai about upstream/downstream effects and other concerns will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Upstream effects as a result of the Project are not anticipated. Some backup of flood water when the diversion structure is in operation is expected, however the backup would reach approximately 500m upstream from the diversion structure. The purpose of the Project is to protect lands and communities downstream. The EIA details the potential effects on all valued components during both construction and dry operations and during a flood.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
40	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.	Hydrogeology Groundwater	Run numerical groundwater model simulations that predict potential effects from construction dewatering. Uncertainty analyses should be completed in the revised numerical groundwater model report. Remodel flood simulations and conduct sensitivity analysis on the model results by introducing	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>high permeability windows into the reservoir base.</p> <p>Conduct and report particle tracking simulations and conduct sensitivity analyses on the particle tracking using high permeability windows.</p> <p>Add bedrock heterogeneities and fractured bedrock to the conceptual hydrostratigraphic framework.</p>				
41	<p>June 25, 2018</p> <p><i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.</p>	Hydrology	<p>Provide a rationale for the LAA selected for the hydrology assessment.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
42	<p>June 25, 2018</p> <p><i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.</p>	Hydrology	<p>Provide a flood frequency analysis incorporating effects of climate change, and determine if the 2013 flood is suitable as the design flood.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
43	<p>June 25, 2018</p> <p><i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.</p>	Springs	<p>Disruptions to natural springs and the potential for interaction between reservoir/flood water and groundwater.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
44	<p>June 25, 2018</p> <p><i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Request</i> by PGL Environmental Consultations, dated June 15, 2018.</p>	Cumulative effects	<p>Cumulative effects for hydrology under construction and dry conditions should be assessed, including the proposed mitigation at Bragg Creek.</p> <p>Scope of EIA must be expanded to include potential effects from all works recommended in the Deltares report.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
45	<p>November 25, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held with Mike Oka, Blood Tribe/Kainai Consultation Coordinator, Stand Off Alberta.</p> <p>March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation</p> <p>June 25, 2018 Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018</p> <p>October 29, 2018 Blood Tribe/Kainai Government Open House</p>	Economic opportunities	<p>Request for job fair and for employment opportunities for members of the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>Establish ASAP the following: who will be employed in the development of the proposed project, what community benefits will be available, and what steps will be taken to address and accommodate future impacts to Blood Tribe/Kainai interests.</p> <p>The Proponent should consult with Blood Tribe/Kainai regarding the establishment of employment targets for Blood Tribe/Kainai community members and the development of a plan to meet those targets.</p> <p>As part of its employment plan, the Proponent should consult with Blood Tribe/Kainai regarding potential support for educational, training, and apprenticeship programs that could facilitate the employment of Blood Tribe/Kainai community members, and especially young people.</p> <p>The Proponent should consult with Blood Tribe/Kainai regarding businesses in the community and potential business and contracting opportunities in relation to the Project. Where possible the Proponent and Blood Tribe/Kainai should attempt to identify opportunities for Direct Negotiated Contracts with Blood Tribe/Kainai businesses.</p> <p>Employment opportunities during construction.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If the Project is approved, Alberta Transportation will follow government procurement policies and procedure with respect to labor, and goods and services. Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible economic opportunities with the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>At the open house held on October 29, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated they are willing to discuss possible economic opportunities with the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
46	November 25, 2014	Monitoring	The Blood Tribe/Kainai requested that they be allowed	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1</i>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>Initial SR1 Meeting held with Mike Oka, Blood Tribe/Kainai Consultation Coordinator, Stand Off Alberta. September 15, 2016</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump March 13, 2017</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation June 25, 2018</p> <p>Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018</p>	<p>Historical Resources</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>Communication</p>	<p>to have monitors on site throughout SR1 construction.</p> <p>Blood Tribe/Kainai requested front line monitors be present throughout the SR-1 construction.</p> <p>Request for on-site monitors during construction.</p> <p>The Proponent should work with Blood Tribe/Kainai in the design and implementation of environmental monitoring. As part of environmental monitoring, the Proponent should consult with Blood Tribe/Kainai to discuss the possibility of training, employment, and contracting opportunities for Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>As part of its environmental monitoring plan, the Proponent and Blood Tribe/Kainai should develop a joint communications plan for the presentation of environmental monitoring results to the community and the incorporation of community feedback.</p>	<p><i>Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If the Project is approved, Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible monitoring opportunities with the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p>			
47	<p>June 25, 2018</p> <p>Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018</p>	<p>Traditional use</p>	<p>Given the potential negative effects of the Project on Blood Tribe/Kainai TU and traditional knowledge, and the traditional way of life and culture of its people, the Proponent should discuss ways to support programming within the community to strengthen the transmission of Blood Tribe/Kainai's way of life and culture to future generations.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
48	<p>June 25, 2018</p> <p>Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018</p>	<p>Training</p>	<p>The Proponent should consult with Blood Tribe/Kainai regarding the design and implementation of cultural-sensitivity training program that</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			is mandatory for all Project employees and contractors.				
49	January 18, 2017 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Piikani Nation, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta.	First Nations Involvement	Blackfoot members should have accompanied Stantec during their EIA work.	<p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Stantec responded that they are paying more attention to First Nations, and they want First Nation input on the EIA. The Blackfoot Nations had access to the SR-1 lands, and now Alberta Transportation and Stantec want to hear their concerns and the impact to their Treaty rights and traditional uses so they can include these in the EIA.</p> <p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Alberta Transportation also responded that they were undertaking the work in accordance with the requirements of the regulatory process. Alberta Transportation indicated that they did not have the authority to change the regulatory process and if the Blood Tribe/Kainai wanted to be directly involved in the EIA process they would have to consult provincial agencies such as Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP), Indigenous Relations, and ACT.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation funded and provided the opportunity for the Blood Tribe/Kainai to visit the site. Nation members visited the site on 13 days.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
50	August 8, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai through their Legal Counsel Clayton Leonard sent an Email to Bob Chappell, Team Lead, Barrister and Solicitor for the Government of Alberta expressing concerns related to upcoming Open Houses for the Springbank SR1.	Notification	<p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai through their legal counsel expressed concern that they were not notified about upcoming public open houses for the Springbank SR1.</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai requested clarification if the Government of Alberta considers the open houses as part of the consultation process. If so, the Blood Tribe/Kainai objects to receiving no notice of them, and indicated that public open houses are not a forum where consultation can occur.</p> <p>The Blood Tribe/Kainai requests a meeting with the Government of Alberta to discuss the consultation plan for the project.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation notified the Blood Tribe/Kainai of upcoming open houses on August 11, 2017, stating that these were not part of the ongoing consultation. On September 3, 2017 Alberta Transportation shared the display boards and handouts from the August open houses.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Notification of the Public Open Houses/Information Sessions for SR1 was provided to the Blood Tribe/Kainai prior to the various information sessions as a courtesy and that notification clearly stated that they were not as part of the consultation with the Blood Tribe/Kainai ongoing for the SR1 Project.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
51	June 19, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai through their Legal Counsel Clayton Leonard sent a letter	First Nation involvement	The Blood Tribe/Kainai object to a tour of the Project area arranged by Alberta Transportation for the Natural Resources Conservation Board	Alberta Transportation responded in a letter on June 22, 2017 to let the Blood Tribe/Kainai know that the tour had been cancelled.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	to Seamas Skelly, Senior Water Projects Technologist. Alberta Transportation; Rick Blackwood, ADM, Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP); Bob Chappell, Alberta Justice		(NRCB) and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA). The Blood Tribe/Kainai objected to the lack of representation of First Nations whose Treaty rights and traditional uses may be impacted by the proposed Project. The Blood Tribe/Kainai also concerned that they were not notified of the tour. The Blood Tribe/Kainai request that the tour be postponed until it can be conducted with proper notification to and involvement of First Nations.				
52	September 18, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai, Dorothy First Rider, Tribal Government Committee Chairperson sent an email to Alberta Transportation expressing concerns.	First Nation involvement Historical Resources	The Blood Tribe/Kainai expressed concerns related to a tour of the SR1 lands from the public road allowances, rather than seeing First Nation heritage sites and hearing from First Nations about their use of the lands.	Alberta Transportation replied to the September 18, 2017 email the same day to let the Blood Tribe/Kainai know they would pass the letter along to CEAA, as they were organizing the tour. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The tour in question was a tour arranged by CEAA on September 19, 2017. Indigenous groups were invited to participate by CEAA. CEAA requested that Alberta Transportation facilitate the tour. At the time of the tour, private land access was not available to all areas of the project development area (PDA).	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
53	June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.	Mitigation	Proponent has yet to provide Blood Tribe/Kainai with an opportunity to review the mitigation measures. Recommendation: Hold at least two mitigation workshops with Blood Tribe/Kainai where Elders, hunters, and consultation personnel have the opportunity to discuss proposed mitigation with Alberta Transportation and develop mutually agreeable mitigation measures.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
54	June 25, 2018	Reclamation	In the event that the Project is to be decommissioned, the Proponent should consult with	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018		Blood Tribe/Kainai regarding the design, implementation, and monitoring of its Reclamation Plan to maximize the use of Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Ecological Knowledge and support Blood Tribe/Blood Tribe/Kainai employment in the reclamation process.				
55	June 25, 2018 Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018	Communication plan	The Proponent should work with Blood Tribe/Kainai in the development of a communications plan for flood and post-flood operations.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
56	March 13, 2017 The Blood Tribe/Kainai delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Siksika Nation	Site access	Blood Tribe/Kainai stated that access was not provided to areas the Blood Tribe/Kainai wanted to visit.	Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Alberta Transportation approved all the Blood Tribe/Kainai budgets for site visits to SR1 and facilitated access to private lands with landowners on all properties the Blood Tribe/Kainai requested. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation approved all the Blood Tribe/Kainai budgets for site visits to SR1 and facilitated access to private lands with landowners on all properties the Blood Tribe/Kainai requested. Nation members visited the site on 13 days. All areas that Blood Tribe/Kainai requested access to were arranged and facilitated by Alberta Transportation.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation.
57	June 25, 2018 <i>Springbank EIS Technical comments – Ermineskin Cree Nation and Blood Tribe.</i> June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018. June 25, 2018 Letter from JFK Law corporation to CEAA, dated June 15, 2018	Land access	Justify how the removal of access to Areas B, C, and D does not constitute a long-term loss of available resources or access to lands. Recommend identifying mitigation measures to allow access during construction and dry operations to Area B, C, and D, subject to safety considerations. Absence of rationale for exclusion of traditional users from Areas B and C during dry operations phase. Recommendation: Negotiate access to Areas B and C during dry operations for traditional gathering, hunting, ceremonial	At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed possible land use planning. Alberta Transportation relayed that land use planning will have to be discussed with the project operator, Alberta Environment and Parks, but there is a possibility to have discussions regarding access to some of the areas.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>use, and for traditional cultural and heritage camps involving Elders and youth.</p> <p>The Proponent should attempt to ensure that Areas B and C of the PDA are accessible to Blood Tribe/Kainai and its members for Traditional Use (TU) purposes, subject to safety considerations related to flooding. If Area C will contain grazing options that are privately managed, the Proponent should work with private managers to ensure maximum access for Blood Tribe/Kainai hunters to the area</p> <p>The Proponent should work with Blood Tribe/Kainai to design an access management plan for Areas B and C. Such a plan could support Blood Tribe/Kainai's access to the area for hunting and other traditional purposes.</p>				
58	<p>June 25, 2018</p> <p><i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Temporal boundaries</p> <p>Spatial boundaries</p>	<p>The temporal parameters are too narrow to be considered valid by the Blood Tribe/Kainai.</p> <p>The spatial parameters chosen for the Traditional Land Resource Use (TLRU) assessment are flawed; i.e., only considering sites in the Project Development Area (PDA) but determining significance of effects using the Regional Assessment Area (RAA).</p> <p>The proponent conflates the PDA, LAA, an RAA in the residual effects significance determination.</p> <p>Absence of information on the spatial parameters of the TLRU/LAA (local assessment area).</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
59	January 5, 2018 Letter from JFK Law Corporation to Deputy Minister Barry Day on behalf of the Blood Tribe/Kainai	Timelines	Requested clarification as to why Blood Tribe/Kainai is being asked for comments on the EIA, given that the EIA does not conform to the EIS guidelines. Information cannot be provided in the time frame given. Request Alberta Transportation's timeline for amending the EIA.	In a letter dated January 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the timelines for the EIA submission, indicating that the timelines had been extended by 60 days to undertake further Indigenous engagement activities. Alberta Transportation also proposed a workshop to discuss TLRU and obtain feedback from the Blood Tribe/Kainai. Alberta Transportation also welcomed written feedback on the updated EIA TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B), which were provided February 5, 2018. In a letter dated January 29, 2018, Alberta Justice responded to the January 5, 2018 letter, referencing the January 26, 2018 letter and Alberta Transportation's offer to hold a workshop. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Following CEAA's non conformance review revisions to the EIA were underway to address regulator comments. In December 2017, Alberta Transportation was looking for feedback from the Blood Tribe/Kainai on the TLRU sections. As the TLRU was updated in early February, a revised draft TLRU section was sent to Blood Tribe/Kainai on February 5, 2018 and Alberta Transportation requested feedback on that document. Alberta Transportation offered a workshop with Blood Tribe/Kainai to better understand how the project potentially impacts Blood Tribe/Kainai and is awaiting on a suitable date to meet. Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further indigenous engagement activities. Feedback was requested by March 1, 2018 in order to meet a resubmission date of end March 2018. Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
60	January 5, 2018 Letter from JFK Law Corporation to Deputy Minister Barry Day on behalf of the Blood Tribe/Kainai	Resources, time, and funding provided to First Nation	Request sufficient time and resources to provide additional information regarding other areas of non-conformity.	In a letter dated January 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the timelines for the EIA submission, indicating that the timelines had been extended by 60 days to undertake further Indigenous engagement activities. Alberta Transportation also proposed a workshop to discuss TLRU and obtain feedback from the Blood Tribe/Kainai. Alberta Transportation also welcomed written feedback on the updated EIA TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B), which were provided February 5, 2018. In a letter dated January 29, 2018, Alberta Justice responded to the January 5, 2018 letter, referencing the January 26, 2018 letter and Alberta Transportation's offer to hold a workshop. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further Indigenous engagement activities. The draft TLRU section (Volumes 3A and 3B) was sent to Blood Tribe/Kainai for review and comment on February 5, 2018. Feedback was	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				requested by March 1, 2018 in order to meet a resubmission date of end March 2018. Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.			
61	January 5, 2018 Letter from JFK Law Corporation to Deputy Minister Barry Day on behalf of the Blood Tribe/Kainai	Resources, time, and funding provided to First Nation	Request time to provide a report outlining Blood Tribe/Kainai's use of the project area.	In a letter dated January 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the timelines for the EIA submission, indicating that the timelines had been extended by 60 days to undertake further Indigenous engagement activities. Alberta Transportation also proposed a workshop to discuss traditional land and resource use (TLRU) and obtain feedback from the Blood Tribe/Kainai. Alberta Transportation also welcomed written feedback on the updated Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B), which were provided February 5, 2018. In a letter dated January 29, 2018, Alberta Justice responded to the January 5, 2018 letter, referencing the January 26, 2018 letter and Alberta Transportation's offer to hold a workshop. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-7 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Kainai First Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: An interim TUS report was delivered by the Blood Tribe/Kainai on March 13, 2017. The TUS study was used in the EIA. However, Permission to use the spatial information from the TUS study has not been received by Alberta Transportation, therefore the information regarding sites and areas has been generalized for use in the EIA and exact locations, including those in the project development area, are not provided.	The Blood Tribe provided an interim joint TUS on March 13, 2017, and <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> on June 25, 2018.	None at this time.	No further action required.
62	October 29, 2018 Blood Tribe/Kainai Government Open House	Design	Why the reservoir was not designed to hold more than the 2013 flood given the potential effects of climate change and increased flooding.	At the open house held on October 29, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained that the 2013 flood is about a 1 in 200 year flood and would be a rare event.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
63	June 25, 2018 <i>Blood Tribe/Kainai Traditional Knowledge, Land, and Resource Use Study: Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> by Oak Road Concepts Inc, dated June 2018.	Project choice	Recommendation: Provide additional rationale to Blood Tribe/Kainai Elders over the choice of location for flood mitigation measures and discuss and clarify alternatives such as McLean Creek.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
64	August 7, 2018 Meeting between the Blood Tribe/Kainai, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Frequency of use	With the flood mitigation at Bragg Creek causing more water to stay in the river, can the flood reach the diversion structure sooner? Does this trigger more use of the project and affect how often it is used?	At the meeting held on August 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation and Stantec committed to looking into this. In an email sent August 28, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided a link to a report done by Wood Group that shows there will be no effect on the SR1 project from the Bragg Creek mitigation.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
65	October 29, 2018 Blood Tribe/Kainai Government Open House	Landowners	Landowners in the area losing their land.	At the open house held on October 29, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained they are working with the landowners to purchase their lands voluntarily, but will move towards expropriation if necessary.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
66	November 25, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held with Mike Oka, Blood Tribe/Kainai Consultation Coordinator, Stand Off Alberta.	Flooding	Concern about if the Waterton Dam breaks which would mean evacuating Stand Off.	At the meeting held on November 25, 2014, Alberta Transportation indicated that the Government of Alberta is looking at the larger flood potential in southern Alberta, however Alberta Transportation could not answer this concern directly.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

Springbank SR1 - Specific Concerns and Response Table

First Nation or Metis Settlement: **Piikani Nation**

Date: **AUGUST 2014 – FEBRUARY 2019**

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
1	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Treaty and Aboriginal Rights	Ongoing mitigation after the finalization of the SR1 Project to ensure no further derogation of Treaty and Aboriginal Rights are infringed upon in the designated SR1 Project Area.	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Some concerns fall outside of Alberta Transportation's jurisdiction. Concerns have been forwarded to the appropriate regulatory agencies.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights are addressed through the assessment of the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. By acknowledging a link between practice-based rights and current use, this assessment accepts that adverse residual effects on availability of traditional resources for current use, on access to traditional resources or areas for current use, or on sites or areas for current use will have a consequent effect on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Given that the residual effects for the Project on traditional land and resource use are predicted to be not significant, no effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights is expected to occur as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for traditional land and resource use (TLRU) can be found in Volume 3A and 3B, section 14. Follow up and monitoring can be found in Volume 3C, Section 2.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
2	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Letter of Objection Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.	Treaty and Aboriginal rights	In the Letter of Objection, Piikani Nation indicated the project will impact the rights and interests of their members and the natural resources upon which they depend.	Alberta Transportation sent a letter dated January 28, 2019 that requested Piikani Nation provide its views and perspectives on its Aboriginal and Treaty rights, cultural and experiential values, and country foods. The letter listed four specific topics that Alberta Transportation was requesting input on to help answer Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) IR2-01, IR2-02, and IR2-08. As of February 28, 2019, Piikani Nation has not provided a response.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation Alberta Transportation sent a letter dated July 30, 2018, acknowledging receipt of the Letter of Objection, Statement of Concern, and the Technical Review, all provided on June 15, 2018.
3	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project	Project planning	Piikani Nation requests that Alberta Transportation discusses how issues of concern to Piikani Nation, their Treaty and Aboriginal Rights, traditional knowledge, and its traditional and contemporary land uses has been used in Project planning and site selection.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.						
4	November 7, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting	Medicinal Plants Traditional Ecological Knowledge	Piikani Nation inquired about getting access to the Springbank SR1 Site. The Piikani Nation wanted to have their Elders involved in site visits on SR1 to assess impacts to medicinal plants and Blackfoot traditional knowledge. The Piikani Nation indicated they would like to complete a Traditional Use Study (TUS) of the SR1 Project area.	Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Piikani Nation to conduct a TUS on the project lands (privately and publicly held). Piikani Nation conducted a TUS (13 field days) in summer/fall of 2016. The Piikani Nation delivered a TUS on February 22, 2017. The TUS study was used to inform the Traditional Land and Resource Use (TLRU) sections of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (Volumes 3A and 3B).	Piikani Nation submitted a TUS report February 22, 2017.	Alberta Transportation funded Piikani Nation's site visits and TUS report.	No further action required.
5	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Information use	Concerns expressed over how information shared by Piikani Nation will be handled by the authorities.	At the meeting held on January 18, 2017 meeting, Stantec stated that they could include input on traditional ecological knowledge and land use into the EIA and report Indigenous findings subject to confidentiality issues. In an email to Piikani Nation on January 30, 2017, Alberta Transportation had stated they will accept an abbreviated TUS rather than the full report, if Piikani Nation would prefer to keep some knowledge internal.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
6	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Historical resources Traditional use	Alberta Transportation should review the information in EIA Tables 14-3 and 14-5 at a workshop so that Piikani Nation use of resources is accurately captured. With so many camps it is likely that water was harvested from the Elbow River and other waterways and that a variety of food and medicinal plants were historically harvested from these areas. Request review of Table 14-3 at a workshop to ensure Piikani Nation use of resources is accurately captured.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
7	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.	Consultation	No consultation has yet occurred with Alberta or Canada. Piikani Nation requests direct consultation to address the project specific and cumulative loss of lands and natural resources and resulting loss of meaningful opportunities for the exercise of Piikani's	Alberta Transportation has been consulting with Piikani Nation since 2014 and has met with them seven times to discuss the project, Piikani Nation's concerns, and responses to those concerns.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			treaty and aboriginal rights and interests.				
8	December 17, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation	Consultation	The Piikani Nation voiced concerns that their concerns would not be taken into account.	At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation reassured Piikani Nation that they were listening to their concerns and taking them into account for the project.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
9	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Consultation	Request a workshop with Piikani Nation consultation office and knowledge holders where commitments related to avoidance measures, mitigation, management, and accommodation strategies will be made prior to any permits or approvals.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
10	August 8, 2016 Site Visit August 16, 2016 Site Visit August 30, 2016 Site Visit August 31, 2016 Site Visit January 18, 2017 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta. September 18-19, 2018 Meetings between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation	Historic Resources	<p>The Piikani Nation Consultation Technicians and Elders while walking property #21, and #24, on both sides of an unnamed creek near the proposed outlet of the reservoir the Piikani Consultation team found what they believed to be evidence of tipi rings.</p> <p>Piikani Nation expressed concern that the tipi rings will be lost if this area is excavated for the SR1 outfall to drain the dry reservoir after a flood event.</p> <p>The Piikani Nation Elders and Consultation technicians while walking SR1 properties #4 and #86 on Mary Robinson's property inspected two possible tipi ring locations, an old camp site and the old North South Trail that runs through the Robinson property.</p> <p>The Piikani Nation are concerned the evidence of these wintering camp grounds and tipi rings will be lost if this area is excavated for the SR1 diversion dikes.</p> <p>The Piikani Nation Elders and Consultation technicians re-inspected the areas on SR1</p>	<p>At the time, the engineering and design work for the SR1 outlet was still underway. The concerns expressed by the Piikani Nation were noted and passed on for consideration as the engineering and design continued for the outlet.</p> <p>In emailed on January 7 and 12, 2017, Alberta Transportation requested the Piikani Nation's TUS prior to the meeting on January 18, 2017, so they could review any detailed site-specific concerns and be prepared to discuss potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation brought Stantec (Alberta Transportation's consultant) to the January 18, 2017 meeting to share information on their EIA field data collection program and methodologies and to gain an understanding of the traditional knowledge and traditional uses component required in the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Project activities within the project development area would disturb 11 precontact period and 11 historic period archaeological sites. No traditional land use sites of very high heritage value, such as spiritual sites or human burial sites have been identified within the project development area. Identified sites include isolated finds, artifact scatters, campsites and historic remains such as homesteads and a school. Effects to historical resources are detailed in the EIA, Volume 3A and 3B, section 13.</p> <p>There will be some limited excavation at the outfall structure (18m) to reduce the speed of the water entering the natural channel. Beyond 18m from the outfall no excavation is proposed.</p> <p>ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the</p>	<p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation agreed to having a map of traditional land use (TLU) sites made as long as the map is kept confidential.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Piikani Nation requested that Alberta Transportation look into avoiding sites identified near the end of the floodplain berm. Piikani Nation also voiced concerns about protecting sites within the outflow channel requesting that flow control measures be looked into in that area.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>properties #21 and #24. Concerns were expressed that there were wintering campgrounds on the east and west side of the unnamed creek which could be destroyed if this area were excavated for the outlet channel which could have a serious impact on Blackfoot cultural items that might exist in these areas.</p> <p>Possible tipi rings discovered.</p> <p>The Piikani Nation Consultation team expressed an interest in having monitors in place during the construction so that they could observe the work being undertaken and to protect Blackfoot artifacts.</p> <p>The Piikani Nation Elders and Consultation technicians re-inspected the areas on SR1 property #4. Concerns were expressed that there were possible tipi rings identified at this location.</p> <p>The Piikani Nation Elders and Consultation technicians were concerned over the potential loss of Blackfoot artifacts by the SR1 construction in this location.</p> <p>Concerns were raised related to impacts on cultural sites by the SR-1 during and after construction.</p> <p>Concerned about cultural sites</p>	<p>requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed creating a map with Piikani Nation identified sites so specific risks and mitigation could be discussed at future meeting.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated their willingness to discuss monitoring programs, and that this was a discussion they were also having with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) (the eventual owner and operator of SR1).</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided a map showing Piikani Nation identified sites in relation to the Project components. Alberta Transportation committed to discussing moving the tail of the floodplain berm with their engineers, as well as looking into the flows at the outflow channel and how that will affect the sites there.</p>			
11	<p>November 7, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump January 18, 2017</p>	Historic Resources	<p>Piikani Nation inquired on the availability of the Historic Resources Impact Assessment (HRIA).</p> <p>Piikani Nation requested archaeological information gathered during the SR1 site investigations.</p> <p>Lack of sharing archaeological data for SR1 is a concern.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that the impacts to historical resources is under Alberta Culture and Tourism's (ACT) jurisdiction, and Stantec/Alberta Transportation are not able to provide that information at this time. Requests for the archaeological studies would have to go through ACT. Should ACT approve the request for the information, Alberta Transportation could then share it.</p> <p>In a letter dated May 10, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated they had forwarded Piikani Nation's archaeological concerns to ACT, and the Treaty 7 contact would be available to them to discuss their concerns.</p>	None at this time.	Alberta Transportation cannot provide the requested information. Alberta Transportation provided the contact information for the Treaty 7 contact at ACT to whom Piikani Nation can make the request.	No further action required.

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta.			On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation is not authorized to disclose the information requested directly to the Piikani Nation. Alberta Transportation contacted ACT and obtained the Treaty 7 representative contact details and passed those details to the Piikani Nation. The Piikani Nation can make their request for the information directly to this individual.			
12	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Historic resources	Request Alberta Transportation's support in better data sharing between ACT and stakeholders to obtain HRIA reports. Request Piikani Nation inclusion in discussions with ACT related to further investigations of identified sites within the construction boundary.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
13	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.	Historical resources	The EIA did not make any specific commitments to protect/avoid TLRU and cultural sites, or any specific commitments to mitigate or accommodate tangible and intangible cultural impacts to Blackfoot culture, traditions and practices that will occur as a result of the Project.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed creating a map with Piikani Nation's identified TLU sites so specific risks and mitigation could be discussed at future meeting. At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided a map showing Piikani Nation identified sites in relation to the Project components. Alberta Transportation committed to discussing moving the tail of the floodplain berm with their engineers, as well as looking into the flows at the outflow channel and how that will affect the sites there.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation agreed to having a map of TLU sites made as long as the map is kept confidential. At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Piikani Nation requested that Alberta Transportation look into avoiding sites identified near the end of the floodplain berm. Piikani Nation also voiced concerns about protecting sites within the outflow channel requesting that flow control measures be looked into in that area.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
14	September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Wildlife Vegetation Information sharing	Piikani Nation requested information on Species at Risk (Wildlife and Plants) gathered during the SR-1 investigations. Request Species at Risk wildlife impact information gathered during the project site investigations.	Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (Plant and Wildlife Species at Risk) will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Twenty-six species of management concern, including 15 birds and 11 mammals were observed during wildlife field surveys between 2015 and 2017. No plant species at risk were recorded during field surveys. Results of the field work are provided in the EIA; Volume 4, Appendix H and L, and Vol 3A sections 10 and 11. At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing; vegetated and gentle slopes; observing restricted activity periods and setbacks during construction; and camera monitoring programs.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation mentioned that the animals may see the area as safe and use it more after the project is built because there will be no more ranching or grazing.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation reiterated the mitigation measures for wildlife.			
15	September 18-19, 2018 Meetings between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation	Wildlife Wildlife habitat	Concerned about the wildlife and wildlife habitat in the area.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing; vegetated and gentle slopes; observing restricted activity periods and setbacks during construction; and camera monitoring programs. At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation reiterated the mitigation measures for wildlife.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation mentioned that the animals may see the area as safe and use it more after the project is built because there will be no more ranching or grazing.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
16	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Wildlife	Alberta Transportation should provide supporting information to demonstrate that successful ungulate crossings can be achieved with the proposed cover materials for rip-rap and revise the significance rating to reflect the predicted measurable change in the abundance and distribution of ungulates in the LAA. Requests information to demonstrate that ungulate crossing can be achieved with the proposed cover and rip-rap. Revise significance rating to reflect predicted change in abundance of ungulates in LAA.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing; vegetated and gentle slopes; observing restricted activity periods and setbacks during construction; and camera monitoring programs.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
17	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Wildlife	The proponent should consult members of all potentially affected indigenous groups to: (i) validate lists of traditionally important wildlife species, (ii) add unique or overlooked species of traditional importance, and (iii) identify if indigenous members have specific knowledge about wildlife patterns within the LAA. Requests collaboration with Piikani Nation to validate inventories to traditionally important wildlife species, and identify if Indigenous members have specific knowledge about wildlife patterns within the LAA.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
18	June 15, 2018	Habitat	Alberta Transportation should collect more data to calibrate habitat suitability models for	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.		specific key indicators and validate assessment predictions.				
19	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Wildlife	Concerned that revegetation measures are insufficiently detailed in describing the benefits of the mitigation on wildlife habitat reinstatement.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing; vegetated and gentle slopes; observing restricted activity periods and setbacks during construction; and camera monitoring programs.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
20	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Wildlife habitat	Requests more information on the four-class wildlife habitat rating scheme.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
21	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Wildlife Medicinal plants	Impacts to wildlife and medicinal plants, especially if one species is altered or annihilated, and how this will affect the ecosystem.	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (wildlife, plants) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Vegetation will be cleared from the project development area during construction. However, effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in the loss of traditionally used species in the local assessment area. The effects on plants and traditional use are assessed in the EIA in Volume 3A and 3B, sections 10 and 14.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation would provide opportunities for harvesting or relocating medicinal and ceremonial plants prior to construction.</p> <p>With the application of mitigation and environmental protection measures, residual environmental effects on wildlife, including migratory birds, species at risk, biodiversity, and provisions to maintain ungulate movement which was recommended by Indigenous groups are predicted to be not significant. The residual effects on change in habitat, movement, and mortality risk are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species including migratory birds and species.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing; vegetated and gentle slopes; observing restricted activity periods and setbacks during construction; and camera monitoring programs.</p>	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation mentioned that the animals may see the area as safe and use it more after the project is built because there will be no more ranching or grazing.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation reiterated the mitigation measures for wildlife.			
22	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Wildlife Fish	Impacts to wildlife and stranding of fish in the reservoir during flood events.	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (wildlife) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in the permanent loss of 1,854 m² fish habitat at the diversion structure. This area has been identified as suitable foraging habitat for trout including, mountain whitefish, brown trout and rainbow trout. The area that will be lost is small compared to the habitat available within the local assessment area, which is approximately 3,100,000 m². Given the limited extent of the habitat affected impacts to fish and fish habitat are predicted to be not significant. The assessment of effects to fish and fish habitat are provided in the EIA Volumes 3A and 3B, section 8.</p> <p>After a flood, the water flows in the diversion channel will be gradually reduced and the reservoir slowly drained to facilitate the movement of fish from the reservoir, back to the Elbow River with the receding water. The outlet will be designed and operated in a manner that allows fish egress out of the reservoir, downstream into the outlet channel. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish during release of stored flood water from the reservoir. During draining of the reservoir, monitoring will be undertaken to identify isolated pools and the potential that fish may become stranded. If potential fish stranding is identified, a fish rescue program will be undertaken to return the fish to the river.</p> <p>With the application of mitigation and environmental protection measures, residual environmental effects on wildlife, including migratory birds, species at risk, biodiversity, and provisions to maintain ungulate movement which was recommended by Indigenous groups are predicted to be not significant. The residual effects on change in habitat, movement, and mortality risk are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species including migratory birds and species.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing; vegetated and gentle slopes; observing restricted activity periods and setbacks during construction; and camera monitoring programs.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that stranded fish will be rescued after the reservoir is emptied.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation reiterated the mitigation measures for fish and wildlife.</p>	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation commented that the animals may see the area as safe and use it more after the project is built because there will be no more ranching or grazing.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
23	September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani	Fish Fish habitat	Piikani Nation requested impact information on fish and fish	Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (fish, fish habitat) will be addressed as part of the EIA.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump	Information sharing	habitat resulting from the SR-1 project.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in the permanent loss of 1,854 m² fish habitat at the diversion structure. This area has been identified as suitable foraging habitat for trout including, mountain whitefish, brown trout and rainbow trout. The area that will be lost is small compared to the habitat available within the local assessment area, which is approximately 3,100,000 m². Given the limited extent of the habitat affected impacts to fish and fish habitat are predicted to be not significant. The assessment of effects to fish and fish habitat are provided in the EIA Volumes 3A and 3B, section 8.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the effects to fish and fish habitat and the mitigation proposed, including that structures will allow fish passage along the Elbow River as well as into and out of the reservoir, and there will be rescue of stranded fish after the reservoir is emptied.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation reiterated the mitigation measures for fish.</p>			
24	<p>September 15, 2016</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Fish	<p>Piikani Nation requested information on how the design of the SR-1 is being undertaken to ensure that during a flood event that the mortality of fish is limited.</p> <p>Request confirmation that fish entrainment will be monitored and a fish salvage plan be put in place.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: After a flood, the water flows in the diversion channel will be gradually reduced and the reservoir slowly drained to facilitate the movement of fish from the reservoir, back to the Elbow River with the receding water. The outlet will be designed and operated in a manner that allows fish egress out of the reservoir, downstream into the outlet channel. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish during release of stored flood water from the reservoir. During draining of the reservoir, monitoring will be undertaken to identify isolated pools and the potential that fish may become stranded. If potential fish stranding is identified, a fish rescue program will be undertaken to return the fish to the river.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation described the effects to fish and fish habitat and the mitigation proposed, including that structures will allow fish passage along the Elbow River as well as into and out of the reservoir, and there will be rescue of stranded fish after the reservoir is emptied.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation reiterated the mitigation measures for fish.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
25	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project</p> <p>June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p>	Fish habitat Consultation	Piikani Nation community representatives should be consulted about plans to provide fish habitat replacement or offset, including the DFO consultation and authorization process.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.		Request a copy of the Fisheries and Oceans Canada application, and request Piikani Nation be consulted with about plans to provide fish habitat replacement or offset.				
26	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Vegetation	<p>Alberta Transportation should complete additional surveys in the 1-km buffer between the Project Development Area (PDA) and Local Assessment Area (LAA) to ground-truth all mapped ecosites and to determine if there are any rare plants, rare plant communities, and/or traditional use species that should be considered for mitigation.</p> <p>Concerned about the lack of survey sites within the 1 km buffer between the PDA and LAA, and requests additional surveys and ground truthing be done to determine if there are any rare plants and/or traditional species.</p> <p>Requests data on how many surveys were completed for each ecosite.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
27	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Consultation</p> <p>Traditional Plants</p> <p>Vegetation</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation did not consult with Piikani Nation members to: include rare traditional plants in the rare surveys, determine if the rare species identified in the RAA and LAA were traditionally important plants, or to develop species-specific mitigation plans for the three species of management concern (SOMC) that might be removed by the Project.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation should consult members of all potentially affected Indigenous groups to ensure accuracy of conclusions in the EIA for</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>traditional use plants and the completeness of the underlying data and analysis.</p> <p>Concerned that Piikani Nation was not consulted about rare plants. Requests Alberta Transportation work with Piikani Nation to identify if rare species in the LAA are traditionally important, and develop mitigation measures.</p> <p>Recommend engaging with Indigenous communities to validate traditional plant inventories and identify if traditional plants within the LAA are being used by Indigenous people.</p>				
28	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Vegetation</p> <p>Traditional plants</p>	<p>The impact assessment of traditional use plant species (Section 10.2.3.2) for Flood and Post-flood Operations should be revised to reflect the loss of traditional use plant species that will be lost with upland and wetland communities submerged during the design flood.</p> <p>Concerned that the impact assessment for traditional use plant species is misleading for the loss of traditional plant species and other vegetation during Flood and Pos-flood Operations.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
29	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Vegetation	<p>Concerned about inconsistent reporting about species of management concern (rare plants) in the PDA.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
30	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank</p>	Vegetation		None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.						
31	<p>June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p> <p>September 18-19, 2018 Meetings between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation</p>	<p>Seeding</p> <p>Reclamation</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>Traditional land use</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation should collaborate with Indigenous communities to ensure that the seed mix (and revegetation plan more generally) includes species of importance to the Piikani Nation and other Indigenous communities.</p> <p>It is necessary that Alberta Transportation engages affected Indigenous communities when developing reclamation monitoring plans to help define meaningful monitoring criteria and indicators for traditional land use objectives and targets including planning for biodiversity potential to support traditional land uses on the post-reclamation landscape.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation should provide a more detailed reclamation plan that outlines how revegetation efforts will mitigate wildlife habitat loss and develop a detailed reclamation plan in collaboration with members of Piikani and other Indigenous communities.</p> <p>Concerned that the Project's revegetation measures did not address species of importance to Indigenous people.</p> <p>Request collaboration with Piikani Nation to develop a revegetation plan and seed mix.</p> <p>Requests only plant species native to region are used in revegetation program.</p> <p>Request discussion of availability of vegetation, fish and wildlife species for food, traditional medicinal and cultural</p>	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to discussing the opportunity for Piikani Nation to be involved in reclamation.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>purposes in the LAA and RAA in the conservation and reclamation plan.</p> <p>Piikani Nation would like the opportunity to provide input on reclamation/seed mixes.</p>				
32	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Reclamation	<p>There are several instances in the EIA in which Alberta Transportation cited "reclamation of temporary disturbances" as the basis for assessing residual project effects as not significant or low in magnitude, but did not present adequate information (e.g., scientific evidence and/or case studies) to demonstrate that successful reclamation could be achieved.</p> <p>Concerned about unsupported arguments relating to vegetation recovery.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
33	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Landscape	<p>Alberta Transportation should revise the Project's residual effects on landscape diversity change to significant and irreversible.</p> <p>Concerned that linear density is already above ecosystem thresholds. Requests reassessment of landscape diversity change.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
34	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</p>	Soil	<p>An assessment of how changes to soil quality and quantity might impact other terrestrial resources, including biodiversity, productivity, and ecological integrity, must be completed and should involve revisions to the determination of significance for the soil quality and quantity section.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.		Concerned about the questionable determination of significance for soil quality and quantity, and requests an assessment of how changes to soil quality and quantity might impact other terrestrial resources.				
35	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.	Soil Indigenous land use	An assessment of how changes to terrain and soil conditions might impact Indigenous land use resulting from implications for terrestrial resources (e.g., vegetation and wildlife) should be completed in collaboration with, and informed by, the Piikani Nation.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
36	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Soil	Concerned about the lack of overlay of soil inspection locations relative to the development area.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
37	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Soil	Concerned that the Project's mitigation measures did not address direct placement of salvaged surface soils.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
38	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Wetlands	General concerns expressed related to impact on wetlands.	Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (wetlands) will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project would result in the loss of 8 ha of estimated high value wetland area and 13 ha of moderate wetland area in the local assessment area. Approximately 312 ha of the local assessment area contains wetland cover types. No vegetation and wetland land units are completely lost, and therefore no significant effects on vegetation and wetlands are predicted. Effects to wetlands are assessed in the EIA in Volumes 3A and 3B section 10.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed the effects to wetlands and the mitigation measures. Lost wetlands will be compensated.			
39	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Upstream and downstream effects	General concerns expressed related to upstream and downstream effects.	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (upstream/downstream effects) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Upstream effects as a result of the Project are not anticipated. Some backup of flood water when the diversion structure is in operation is expected, however the backup would reach approximately 500m upstream from the diversion structure, Volume 3A, Section 18 Figure 18-3.</p> <p>The purpose of the Project is to protect lands and communities downstream. The EIA details the potential effects on all valued components during both construction and dry operations and during a flood.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018 Alberta Transportation discussed the upstream/downstream effects. There will be no difference to present conditions during dry operations. Flood condition effects will be lessened as a result of the excess flows being diverted into the off-stream reservoir.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that there may be some naturally occurring erosion from the flood flow, but they have designed the project so that the instream gates do not increase flows on the river and therefore erosion would not be increased. The diversion channel will have some armouring to prevent erosion at vulnerable spots.</p>	At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Piikani Nation voiced concerns about increased river flows and erosion downstream of the gates.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
40	January 18, 2017 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta.	Flooding Downstream effects	Concern raised regarding the effect on the environment after a flood, and what mitigation will occur when the area is flooded.	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The potential effects on the environment after a flood are detailed in the EIA, Volume 3B, including mitigation measures for post flood activities. Follow up and monitoring will occur after a flood, the details of which are presented in the EIA, Volume 3C, section 2.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation.
41	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Surface water Downstream effects	Impact of the silt shadow on downstream forests and river valleys.	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (downstream effects) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Flood-operations would occur when suspended sediment concentrations in the Elbow River are already high. The Project would not substantially change these high concentrations during diversion. During</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>the last few days of water release back into Elbow River, suspended sediment concentrations are predicted to increase in the low-level outlet and cause a short-term peak.</p> <p>Suspended sediment concentrations are expected to be high during Elbow River floods and settle out of the water when the water is retained in the reservoir. Most of the settled sediment would stay in reservoir during water release.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained that sediment will remain in the reservoir after a flood and it is expected that natural vegetation will re-establish. Grass seed can also be applied.</p>			
42	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Groundwater</p> <p>Traditional uses</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation should confirm that it has considered potential traditional groundwater use in any culturally sensitive areas and if traditionally used, develop mitigative measures to protect these sensitive areas. Alberta Transportation should also consult with community members to inform and participate in related monitoring activities.</p> <p>Clarify if potential traditional groundwater use in any culturally sensitive areas has been considered.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
43	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Groundwater</p> <p>Monitoring</p>	<p>Additional monitoring is required to validate assessment predictions to better understand potential effects on groundwater quality and quantity in the Regional Assessment Area (RAA).</p> <p>Adequate groundwater (levels and quality) monitoring during construction and dry operation of the Project will be necessary to confirm the localized effects on groundwater surface water interaction.</p> <p>Piikani Nation requests Alberta Transportation monitor the effects of dewatering during construction.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
44	<p>June 15, 2018</p>	<p>Hydrogeology</p> <p>Water quality</p>	<p>Piikani Nation requests Alberta Transportation conduct additional water quality sampling</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.		from more wells, long-term monitoring of more wells, updates Piikani Nation of these results, and consults with Piikani Nation about mitigation plans should there be unexpected effects to groundwater quality in the RAA.				During the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to responding to the technical review.
45	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Hydrology	Piikani Nation requests clarification on the operation of the diversion channel when natural flows are between 160 m ³ /s and 200 m ³ /s (i.e., <1 in 10 year flood events).	At the meeting held on December 17, 2019, Alberta Transportation described how the project would be used when flows are over 160 m ³ /s.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
46	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Water levels	Further monitoring of the existing network along with additional further water level monitoring at locations at further distances from the RAA are recommended to help verify model predictions and reduce uncertainty. Piikani Nation requests Alberta Transportation conduct additional water level monitoring and updates Piikani on the results.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
47	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Cyanobacteria Water quality	Alberta Transportation should provide an assessment of the potential for the off-stream reservoir to develop cyanobacterial blooms, which might result in the production of microcystin toxins that could be introduced downstream during water release to the Elbow River and the drinking water supply, Glenmore Reservoir and develop and communicate contingency plans. Concerns related to water quality, water quality monitoring, and cyanobacteria blooms.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
48	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Sediment deposition</p> <p>Sediment transport</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation should explain and clarify what measures will be in place to maintain coarse sediment and/or bedload transport downstream in the Elbow River downstream of the diversion channel; how storage capacity would be maintained on an annual basis when it might be reduced due to sediment deposition within the reservoir and how the integrity of the low-level outlet channel would be maintained.</p> <p>Clarify how coarse sediment transport downstream will be maintained if discharges >160 m³/s will no longer occur. Importance of sediment deposition and resuspension dynamics should be discussed.</p> <p>Clarify how reservoir storage capacity would be confirmed and maintained, as storage capacity may be reduced due to sediment deposition.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
49	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Hydrology	Clarify how the low-level outlet channel would be designed to maintain the integrity of the existing channel, limit bank erosion, and maintain environmental values.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
50	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose &</p>	Contamination	<p>Alberta Transportation should consider aquatic impacts related not only to herbicides applied to control vegetation during Project operations, but also any existing hydrocarbons including herbicides that are on lands within the full project footprint. Alberta Transportation should also assess the potential for methyl mercury to be produced within the flooded reservoir and transported to the Elbow River during water release; assesses</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Associates Inc., dated June 2018.		<p>the potential for methylmercury produced in the flooded reservoir to be bioaccumulated by fish to levels that might not otherwise occur (and that might exceed human consumption guidelines in the Elbow River). Monitoring should also include inorganic mercury and methylmercury in reservoir sediments, in water overlying sediments, and at the low-level outlet during water release, as well as in fish tissue just prior to salvaging fish back to the Elbow River.</p> <p>Concerns related to increased herbicide concentrations and other contaminants getting into the water during a flood.</p> <p>Concerns regarding methylmercury, including potential for methylmercury to be transported into the Elbow River, bioaccumulation, and monitoring.</p>				
51	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	Air quality	General concerns related to effects on air quality from flood residue spread by the wind.	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Piikani Nation (air quality) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The only potential source of fugitive dust during post-flood operations is wind erosion of deposited sediments in the reservoir after they dry out, and when strong wind conditions occur. Because these emissions are ground based, the greatest air quality changes due to these emissions occur inside and near the project development area, decreasing to background levels with increasing distance from the project development area. The main finding of the modeling completed for the EIA is the potential for dust concentrations to be greater than the regulatory criteria outside the project development area. However, given the low recurrence of the floods that result in sediment deposition (i.e. 100 years and design flood [200 years]) and the proposed mitigation measures, it is expected that fugitive dust emissions would not have significant adverse effects on ambient air quality.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed the modelling that had been done for dust. Wind will move dust in a north westerly direction. Sediment sampling has shown that most of the sediment is not small enough to mobilized by wind.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
52	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Disturbances	<p>More effort is required to ensure that existing disturbance is incorporated into project footprints, especially for projects such as this that are in heavily fragmented areas that have few remaining areas with sufficient interior habitat area to support undisturbed traditional use.</p> <p>Concerned that the Project footprint might not absorb enough existing disturbance. Request commitment to make every effort to adapt current plans to minimize the development footprint.</p> <p>Request that Government of Alberta develops relevant policies and criteria for assessing, guiding, and achieving disturbance minimization, and consults with Indigenous people regarding this.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
53	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p>	Cumulative effects	<p>Alberta Transportation should compare Project cumulative effects to a pre-development Baseline and revise the significance ranking in the Vegetation and Wetlands section of the Cumulative Effects Assessment.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
54	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p> <p>December 17, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation</p>	Ceremony	<p>Request at least three weeks' notice prior to disturbing these areas so Elders can be consulted and appropriate protocol, including ceremonies, can be planned before construction.</p> <p>The Piikani Nation would like to perform a ceremonial sweat at the site of the tipi rings and perform other ceremonies before construction.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to support ceremonies being performed.</p>	None at this time.	<p>Alberta Transportation will fund and participate in ceremonies, if requested.</p>	No further action required.
55	<p>January 18, 2017</p>	First Nations Involvement	<p>The Piikani Nation and the remainder of the Blackfoot Confederacy indicated that they</p>	<p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Stantec responded that they are paying more attention to First Nations, and they want First Nation input on the EIA. The Blackfoot Nations had access to the SR-1 lands, and now</p>	<p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation expressed their desire to be involved in</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation in Lethbridge, Alberta.		should have accompanied Stantec during their EIA work.	<p>Alberta Transportation and Stantec want to hear their concerns and the impact to their Treaty rights and traditional uses so they can include these in the EIA.</p> <p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Alberta Transportation also responded that they were undertaking the work in accordance with the requirements of the regulatory process. Alberta Transportation indicated that they did not have the authority to change the regulatory process and if the Piikani Nation wanted to be directly involved in the EIA process they would have to consult provincial agencies such as Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP), Indigenous Relations, and ACT.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation funded and provided the opportunity for the Piikani Nation to visit the site. Nation members visited the site on 13 days.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation and Piikani Nation discussed potential ways that Piikani Nation may be involved in the Project moving forward, including: monitoring; land use planning; and educational programs.</p>	monitoring, land use planning, and educational programs for the Project.		
56	February 22, 2017 The Piikani Nation delivered a Traditional Use Report	First Nation involvement Historical Resources	<p>The proponents of the project need to revise the language regarding mitigation and consider participation of Siksikaitsitapii (Keepers of our Language) in the official assessment by the experts utilized to confirm the authenticity of the historic and archeological sites discovered.</p> <p>If the project proceeds to the stage of construction another stage of consultation needs to proceed with Siksikaitsitapii prior to actual excavation and removal of material from the sites of the diversion.</p> <p>Existence of many archaeological sites within the SR-1 area.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Concerns that fall out of Alberta Transportation's jurisdiction have been forwarded to the appropriate regulatory agencies. Concerns regarding historical resources have been forwarded to ACT and the Treaty 7 contact would be available to discuss concerns further.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>If the Project is approved, Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible monitoring opportunities with the Piikani First Nation.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed creating a map with Piikani Nation identified sites so specific risks and mitigation could be discussed at future meetings.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated their willingness to discuss monitoring programs, and that this was a discussion they were also having with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) (the eventual owner and operator of SR1).</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided a map showing Piikani Nation identified sites in relation to the Project components. Alberta Transportation committed to discussing moving the tail of the floodplain berm with their engineers, as well as</p>	<p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Piikani Nation agreed to having a map of TLU sites made as long as the map is kept confidential.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Piikani Nation requested that Alberta Transportation look into avoiding sites identified near the end of the floodplain berm. Piikani Nation also voiced concerns about protecting sites within the outflow channel requesting that flow control measures be looked into in that area.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				looking into the flows at the outflow channel and how that will affect the sites there.			
57	September 18-19, 2018 Meetings between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation	Economic opportunities	Opportunities for Piikani Nation to purchase excess Crown land.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to reviewing the process for selling and purchasing the excess Crown land and bringing that information back to Piikani Nation.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
58	September 18-19, 2018 Meetings between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation	Educational programs	Piikani Nation would like there to be education and cultural awareness programs, programs for youth.	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed cultural awareness programs with the Piikani Nation and committed to more discussions on the topic.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
59	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.	Monitoring	Concerned that monitoring will not include Indigenous communities and requests Alberta Transportation provide opportunities and financial capacity for communities to meaningfully participate in the planning and implementation of monitoring.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If the Project is approved, AT is willing to discuss possible monitoring opportunities with the Piikani First Nation. At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated their willingness to discuss monitoring programs, and that this was a discussion they were also having with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) (the eventual owner and operator of SR1).	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
60	September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Piikani Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Siksika Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018. December 17, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation	Historic Resources Monitoring	Piikani Nation requested front line monitors be present throughout the SR-1 construction. Alberta Transportation should include the Piikani Nation in discussions with ACT related to further investigations of identified sites; present the results once all Baseline information is collected; and provide an opportunity to monitor construction activities near known cultural resources including the flats north of the berm location, the bottom of the Elbow riverbed and on a tributary creek channel off the Elbow River. Request opportunity to monitor construction activities near known cultural resources. The Piikani Nation would like to have monitors on site during construction and after a flood to see if any sites are unearthed.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-6 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Piikani Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If the Project is approved, Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible monitoring opportunities with the Piikani First Nation. At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed that there will be monitoring opportunities throughout the phases of the Project. At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated their willingness to discuss monitoring programs, and that this was a discussion they were also having with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) (the eventual owner and operator of SR1).	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
61	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Monitoring</p> <p>Biodiversity</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation should provide a more detailed description of its wildlife monitoring program and provide capability for the Piikani Nation to participate in the monitoring program.</p> <p>It is Piikani Nation's view that monitoring plans for biodiversity should be completed as a condition for approval and that the plans should be submitted to the Piikani Nation for examination and input.</p> <p>Concerned that Piikani Nation was not engaged in biodiversity planning and would like Piikani Nation involvement in decision making related to biodiversity reestablishment.</p> <p>Concerned about lack of information regarding mitigation and monitoring for impacts to biodiversity. Requests development of biodiversity monitoring plans and Piikani Nation involvement.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
62	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	<p>Soil</p> <p>Land use</p> <p>Monitoring</p>	<p>Concerned that there has been no discussion on how changes to terrain and soil might impact Indigenous land use.</p> <p>Requests a monitoring plan be developed with Piikani Nation to monitor impacts to soil conditions.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
63	<p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018.</p> <p>June 15, 2018</p> <p>Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study,</p>	<p>Plants</p> <p>Fish</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <p>Monitoring</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation should: discuss the availability of vegetation, fish and wildlife species for food, traditional medicinal and cultural purposes in the LSA and RSA in the Conservation and Reclamation plan; develop a monitoring plan with the Piikani to assess Project effects on hunting, trapping, fishing, plant harvesting and cultural use following Project development;</p>	At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated their willingness to discuss monitoring programs, and that this was a discussion they were also having with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) (the eventual owner and operator of SR1).	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.		<p>develop Project-specific triggers and limits with Piikani for the Project's mitigation, management and monitoring plans that reflect Community TEK and ecological and cultural values; and consider supporting Piikani's cultural retention strategies, including plans to establish community-based monitoring of key cultural species and practices.</p> <p>Request Alberta Transportation considers supporting Piikani Nation's cultural retention strategies, including plans to establish community based monitoring of key cultural species and practices.</p> <p>Request development of monitoring plan with Piikani Nation to assess Project effects on hunting, trapping, fishing, plant harvesting, and cultural use.</p> <p>Request development with Piikani Nation of Project-specific triggers and limits for the Project's mitigation, management, and monitoring plans that reflect community traditional ecological knowledge and cultural values.</p>				
64	<p>June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Statement of Concern Springbank off-Stream Reservoir Project June 2018. June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.</p>	Land access	<p>Alberta Transportation should collaborate with Piikani Nation and other Indigenous communities to develop an access management plan (AMP) for roads and other linear access features associated with the Project with restrictions on non-essential access, and with reasonable allowances that give Indigenous communities access to traditional lands.</p> <p>It is not clear how access for Piikani Nation members would be coordinated such that they would be able to carry out</p>	At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation and Piikani Nation discussed land use planning and committed to continued discussions on the topic.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	September 18-19, 2018 Meetings between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation		<p>ceremonies within the conservation area (Area A) or how the province would facilitate activities such as hunting within an area intended for multi-use including access by recreational users.</p> <p>Request collaboration with Piikani Nation to develop an access management plan for roads and other linear access features associated with the Project. Specifically, restrictions on non-essential access and allowances to allow Piikani Nation access to traditional lands.</p> <p>Request co-development of an Access Management Plan for Area A.</p> <p>Requests Alberta Transportation works with Piikani Nation to ensure cultural and spiritual values are integrated when developing access management plans.</p> <p>Describe how the Project will align with existing land use documents, guidelines, and policies, and how Aboriginal rights and interests will be accommodated.</p> <p>Piikani Nation would like to be involved in land use planning.</p>				
65	September 18-19, 2018 Meetings between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Piikani Nation	Access Ceremonies	Access to plants, animals, for bundles and ceremony.	<p>At the meetings held on September 18-19, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated they will provide opportunities for First Nations to harvest traditional plants prior to construction. Alberta Transportation also offered to have a ceremony prior to construction if Piikani Nation is interested. Alberta Transportation and Piikani Nation discussed the long-term land use plan and committed to continued discussions on the topic.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 17, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to support ceremonies being performed.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
66	June 15, 2018 Piikani Nation Technical Review of Alberta Transportation Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project	Traditional use	Requests discussions with Piikani Nation and other communities to consider constructing a permanent memorial dedicated to historical use and occupancy of these	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Schaldemose & Associates Inc., dated June 2018.		lands by Blackfoot people, and later Tsuut'ina and Stoney.				

Springbank SR1 - Specific Concerns and Response Table

First Nation or Metis Settlement: **Siksika Nation**

Date: **AUGUST 2014 – FEBRUARY 2019**

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
1	<p>May 20, 2016</p> <p>Siksika Nation Letter to Alberta Transportation (DEMA) in support of their TUS budget request.</p>	<p>Traditional Use</p>	<p>The Siksika Nation stated the SR1 project proposed for the Elbow River can be reasonably expected to have substantial impacts on Siksika traditional use right and interests, and, heritage sites, protected by Section 35 of the Constitution. They can be expected to include both upstream and downstream impacts during the construction and operation of the SR1 control structure. Given that the Elbow River is a major transport corridor for Siksika members and has been for millennia, is expected that the impacts on Siksika traditional use and sites will be substantial.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Siksika Nation to conduct a Traditional Use Study (TUS) on the project lands (privately and publicly held).</p> <p>Siksika Nation conducted a TUS (10 field days) in summer/fall of 2016. The Siksika Nation delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report on March 13, 2017 that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe.</p> <p>Following the completion of the Siksika Nation's site visits and Alberta Transportation's Historical Resource Impact Assessment a meeting was held at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump with the Siksika Nation, the Blood Tribe, and the Piikani Nation on Sept 15, 2016, with a second meeting in Lethbridge on January 18, 2017.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights are addressed through the assessment of the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. By acknowledging a link between practice-based rights and current use, this assessment accepts that adverse residual effects on availability of traditional resources for current use, on access to traditional resources or areas for current use, or on sites or areas for current use will have a consequent effect on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Given that the residual effects for the Project on TLRU are predicted to be not significant, no effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights is expected to occur as a result of the Project.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>In response to Siksika Nation's additional concerns raised at the April 26, 2018 meeting, Alberta Transportation explained that the Project creates more Crown land than there was before, and there is a possibility of an agreement for First Nations to use some of the reservoir area.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation put forward their desire to work with Siksika Nation to develop a land use plan that includes access for traditional use.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent a letter dated January 28, 2019 that requested the Siksika Nation provide its views and perspectives on its Aboriginal and Treaty rights, cultural and experiential values, and country foods. The letter listed four specific topics that Alberta Transportation was requesting input on to help answer Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation responded that Treaty Rights are not just about plants and animals, but the lands should be looked at as a whole. Crown lands are getting smaller while the population gets bigger.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Siksika Nation expressed concerns regarding the viability of the land use plan and indicated they would want to see a land use plan before commenting on it. There were concerns that the Siksika Nation would be asked to consult and then their input would not be used in the final plan, leaving them without access to the landscape.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				(CEAA) IR2-01, IR2-02, and IR2-08. As of February 28, 2019, Siksika Nation has not provided a response.			
2	October 27, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held in Siksika, Alberta.	Medicinal Plants Traditional Knowledge Traditional Use Studies	The Siksika Nation wanted to have their Elders involved when medicinal plants and Traditional Knowledge is being assessed. The Siksika Nation indicated they would like to complete a Traditional Use Study of the SR1 Project Area.	At the October 27, 2014 meeting, Alberta Transportation indicated there could be funding for Siksika Nation to do a Traditional Use Study (TUS). Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Siksika Nation to conduct a Traditional Use Study on the project lands (privately and publicly held). On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation funded a Siksika Traditional Use Study (TUS). Siksika Nation spent 7 days in the field in 2016, and delivered an interim TUS co-authored with the Kainai Nation on March 13, 2017. The findings of the TUS study were incorporated into the EIA. On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> .	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation stated they would discuss with the Blood Tribe/Kainai about getting a final TUS report submitted. As of February 28, 2019, Siksika Nation has not submitted a final TUS.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
3	April 26, 2018 Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Traditional Use Studies	Siksika Nation would like to do a traditional use survey of Area A.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
4	April 26, 2018 Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Traditional territory	Siksika Nation would like the description and representation of Stoney Nakoda Nation's traditional territory pulled from the filing, or an opportunity for Siksika Nation to present a thorough description.	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation suggested Siksika Nation use the submission of their final TUS report to address traditional territory. Comments about the submission can also be made directly to CEAA. During a phone call on July 6, 2018, and in emails on July 16, 2018 and September 7, 2018, Alberta Transportation further explained the inclusion of the reference to the Stoney Nakoda Nation Statement of Claim. Alberta Transportation explained that the map and claim reference was provided by Stoney Nakoda Nation's legal counsel and maps of traditional territory were required by the regulator. Alberta Transportation's intent is not to substantiate or agree with the claim.	During the phone call on July 6, 2018, Siksika First Nation indicated they will discuss Alberta Transportation's response and let Alberta Transportation know what action, if any, Siksika Nation may require regarding this matter.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
5	July 21, 2016 Site Visit August 9, 2016 Site Visit August 10, 2016 Site Visit September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai,	Historical Resources	The Siksika Nation Elders and Technicians on inspection of Property #21 along the "unnamed creek" identified what they believed to be tipi rings on the north side of the unnamed creek, and indicated that it was a wintering ground for the Blackfoot many years ago. Siksika Nation expressed concern that the tipi rings are potentially located adjacent to the SR1 reservoir outfall along	Alberta Transportation requested the Siksika Nation's Traditional Use Study prior to the meeting on January 7, 2017 so they could review any detailed site-specific concerns and be prepared to discuss potential mitigation measures. Alberta Transportation brought Stantec (Alberta Transportation's consultant) to the January 18, 2017 meeting to share information on their EIA field data collection program and methodologies and to gain an understanding of the Traditional Knowledge and traditional uses component required in the EIA. In the letter dated May 10, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated they took direction on mitigation for cultural and historical resources directly from ACT. Alberta Transportation forwarded Siksika Nation's concerns to ACT, and ACT's Treaty 7 advisor would be able to discuss further.	The Siksika Nation delivered a Joint Interim Traditional Use Report on March 13, 2017 that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe. At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation were still concerned about tipi rings and historical trails being destroyed. They requested more information on what will be impacted by construction. They were also concerned about burials in the area, as people may have been buried in tipis or in trees. Some of the tipi rings may	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>and Piikani Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump January 18, 2017</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation in Lethbridge Alberta. March 13, 2017</p> <p>The Siksika Nation delivered an "Interim" Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe.</p>		<p>an unnamed creek into the Elbow River.</p> <p>The Siksika Nation Elders and Consultation technicians re-inspected the areas on SR1 properties #21 and #24. The Siksika Nation are concerned the evidence of wintering grounds and tipi rings will be lost if this area is excavated for the SR1 outfall to drain the dry reservoir after a flood event.</p> <p>The Siksika Nation Elders and Consultation technicians inspected the areas on SR1 properties #6 and #9. Concerns were expressed that the excavations for the diversion channels could have a serious impact on Blackfoot cultural items that might exist in these areas.</p> <p>Concerns emphasizing the need to protect artifacts and sites such as old camp sites, tipi rings, and other rock markers.</p> <p>Concerns were raised related to impacts on cultural sites by the SR1 during and after construction.</p> <p>Expressed concerns related to ceremonial locations and impacts to Blackfoot cultural sites.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Project activities within the project development area would disturb 11 precontact period and 11 historic period archaeological sites. No traditional land use sites of very high heritage value, such as spiritual sites or human burials have been identified within the project development area. Identified sites include isolated finds, artifact scatters, campsites and historic remains such as homesteads and a school. Effects to historical resources are detailed in the EIA, Volume 3A and 3B, section 13.</p> <p>There will be some limited excavation at the outfall structure (18m) to reduce the speed of the water entering the natural channel. Beyond 18m from the outfall no excavation is proposed.</p> <p>ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historical resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated that while the flow at the outlet channel can be controlled to reduce potential erosion, the rate of release may be determined by many factors including but not limited to the need to prepare for another imminent flood.</p>	<p>represent burials. Siksika Nation suggested the flow at the outlet channel can be controlled to reduce potential effects on the campsites located there.</p>		
6	<p>April 26, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	<p>Historical Resources</p>	<p>Concerns about the Blackfoot trail and campsites around Mary Robinson's property. Will they be impacted by construction?</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated that the log cabin would be affected, but the trail would not. Alberta Transportation will verify and respond.</p> <p>In an email on July 20, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided the following response: The Old Blackfoot Trail is located outside of the Project Development Area (PDA) and will not be affected by construction. Alberta Transportation is not aware of the locations of any campsites on Mary Robinson's property; none were identified on the property during the heritage resources survey of the Project Development Area. If specific locations are identified, Alberta Transportation will determine if the location is inside the PDA and therefore may be impacted by project construction. If the area falls within the PDA all necessary regulatory requirements,</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				policies and procedures will be followed with respect to the site, which will include discussions with ACT.			
7	<p>September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump January 18, 2017 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation in Lethbridge Alberta.</p>	Historical Resources Information sharing	<p>Siksika Nation requested archaeological information gathered during the SR1 Site investigations. Lack of sharing archaeological data for SR1 is a concern</p>	<p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that the impacts to historical resources is under ACT's jurisdiction, and Stantec/Alberta Transportation are not able to provide that information at this time. Requests for the archaeological studies would have to go through ACT. Should ACT approve the request for the information, Alberta Transportation could then share it.</p> <p>In the letter dated May 10, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated they took direction on mitigation for cultural and historical resources directly from ACT. Alberta Transportation forwarded Siksika Nation's concerns to ACT, and ACT's Treaty 7 advisor would be able to discuss further.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation is not authorized to disclose the information requested directly to the Siksika Nation. Alberta Transportation contacted Alberta Culture and Tourism and obtained the Treaty 7 representative contact details and passed those details to the Siksika Nation. The Siksika Nation can make their request for the information directly to this individual.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p>	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation stated that Alberta Transportation's response was "straightforward."	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.
8	October 27, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held in Siksika, Alberta.	Historical Resources Medicinal and ceremonial plants	Expressed concern on potential impact from the SR1 on Blackfoot artifacts, ceremonial and medicinal plants.	<p>At the meeting held on October 27, 2014, Alberta Transportation indicated there could be funding for Siksika Nation to respond to the historical resources and environmental studies.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Project activities within the project development area would disturb 11 precontact period and 11 historic period archaeological sites. No traditional land use sites of very high heritage value, such as spiritual sites or human burials have been identified within the project development area. Identified sites include isolated finds, artifact scatters, campsites and historic remains such as homesteads and a school. Effects to historical resources are detailed in the EIA, Volume 3A and 3B, section 13.</p> <p>There will be some limited excavation at the outfall structure (18m) to reduce the speed of the water entering the natural channel. Beyond 18m from the outfall no excavation is proposed.</p> <p>Alberta Culture and Tourism's (ACT) independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the <i>Historical Resources Act</i>. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historical resources as determined by ACT.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation were still concerned about tipi rings and historical trails being destroyed. They requested more information on what will be impacted by construction. They were also concerned about burials in the area, as people may have been buried in tipis or in trees. Some of the tipi rings may represent burials. Siksika Nation suggested the flow at the outlet channel can be controlled to reduce potential effects on the campsites located there.</p> <p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation indicated they were open to transplanting, but would need more discussion and information, including where the plants would be transplanted. Late May to late June would be the ideal time period to conduct a study. Siksika Nation stated</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>Vegetation will be cleared from the project development area during construction. However, effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in the loss of traditionally used species in the local assessment area. The effects on plants and traditional use are assessed in the EIA in Volume 3A and 3B, sections 10 and 14.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation would provide opportunities for harvesting or relocating medicinal and ceremonial plants prior to construction.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated that while the flow at the outlet channel can be controlled to reduce potential erosion, the rate of release may be determined by many factors including but not limited to the need to prepare for another imminent flood.</p>	<p>this was something they would need to caucus on. Siksika Nation would like to monitor before and after a flood to understand what is growing in the Project area.</p>		
9	<p>September 15, 2016</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump</p>	<p>Wildlife</p> <p>Vegetation</p> <p>Information sharing</p>	<p>Siksika Nation requested information on Species at Risk (Wildlife and Plants) gathered during the SR1 investigations.</p>	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Siksika Nation (Plant and Wildlife Species at Risk) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Twenty-six species of management concern, including 15 birds and 11 mammals were observed during wildlife field surveys between 2015 and 2017. No plant species at risk were recorded during field surveys. Results of the field work are provided in the EIA; Volume 4, Appendix H and L, and Vol 3A sections 10 and 11.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation described some of the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing and vegetated and gentle slopes.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation indicated they were open to transplanting, but would need more discussion and information, including where the plants would be transplanted. Siksika Nation stated this was something they would need to caucus on. Siksika Nation would like to monitor before and after a flood to understand what is growing in the Project area.</p> <p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Siksika Nation reiterated concerns about wildlife, and how the 2013 flood affected especially the deer population. They indicated they would have more comments on wildlife later.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
10	<p>January 18, 2017</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation in Lethbridge Alberta.</p>	<p>Wildlife</p>	<p>Concerns expressed on SR1 construction impact to animal homes, such as the beavers.</p>	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Siksika Nation (wildlife) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: No beaver dams were identified during surveys conducted for the Project. It is not anticipated that the Project would affect beaver dams. In the event of a flood, effects to beaver dams may occur whether the Project is in place or not. The effects of the Project to wildlife and aquatic species are discussed in the EIA Volumes 3A and 3B, sections 8 and 11.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation described some of the mitigation for wildlife that is present in the EIA. This includes: wildlife friendly fencing and vegetated and gentle slopes.</p>			
11	<p>April 26, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	Wildlife	Request for further information on wildlife studies where the back up of water would occur.	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Stantec indicated that water would back up regardless of whether the project was present or not.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
12	<p>September 15, 2016</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump</p>	<p>Fish</p> <p>Fish Habitat</p> <p>Information sharing</p>	Siksika Nation requested impact information on fish and fish habitat resulting from the SR1 project.	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Siksika Nation (fish, fish habitat) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in the permanent loss of 1,854 m² fish habitat at the diversion structure. This area has been identified as suitable foraging habitat for trout including, mountain whitefish, brown trout and rainbow trout. The area that will be lost is small compared to the habitat available within the local assessment area, which is approximately 3,100,000 m². Given the limited extent of the habitat affected impacts to fish and fish habitat are predicted to be not significant. The assessment of effects to fish and fish habitat are provided in the EIA Volumes 3A and 3B, section 8.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained the mitigation for fish that is in the EIA, and described that there will be a plan for a monitoring and fish rescue program after the foods had passed and the reservoir was releasing the water.</p> <p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation said they will look into replacement or compensation for lost habitat. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans is involved in reviewing replacing habitat or compensation.</p>	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation asked that the habitat be replaced/compensated with suitable habitat. They stated they would like to hear further from a fisheries expert as to what would be deemed suitable.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
13	<p>September 15, 2016</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump</p> <p>December 10, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.</p>	Fish	<p>Siksika Nation requested information on how the design of the SR1 is being undertaken to ensure that during a flood event that the mortality of fish is limited.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about fish entering the reservoir during a flood.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: After a flood, the water flows in the diversion channel will be gradually reduced and the reservoir slowly drained to facilitate the movement of fish from the reservoir, back to the Elbow River with the receding water. The outlet will be designed and operated in a manner that allows fish egress out of the reservoir, downstream into the outlet channel. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish during release of stored flood water from the reservoir. During draining of the reservoir, monitoring will be undertaken to identify isolated pools and the potential that fish may become stranded. If potential fish stranding</p>	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation stated that Alberta Transportation's response answered their question.	Alberta Transportation's response satisfactory to First Nation. There will be a monitoring and rescue program for stranded fish in the reservoir after release of the water.	No further action required.

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>is identified, a fish rescue program will be undertaken to return the fish to the river.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained the mitigation for fish that is in the EIA, and described that there will be a plan for a monitoring and fish rescue program after the foods had passed and the reservoir was releasing the water.</p>			
14	<p>March 13, 2017</p> <p>The Siksika Nation delivered an "Interim" Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe.</p>	<p>Medicinal and ceremonial plants</p>	<p>Concerns expressed on the potential impact to medicinal and ceremonial plants. Stated that these will need to be protected or relocated.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Siksika Nation about impacts to cultural and historical resources and other general concerns will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Vegetation will be cleared from the project development area during construction. However, effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in the loss of traditionally used species in the local assessment area. The effects on plants and traditional use are assessed in the EIA in Volume 3A and 3B, sections 10 and 14.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation would provide opportunities for harvesting or relocating medicinal and ceremonial plants prior to construction.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation indicated they were open to transplanting, but would need more discussion and information, including where the plants would be transplanted. Siksika Nation stated this was something they would need to caucus on. Siksika Nation would like to monitor before and after a flood to understand what is growing in the Project area.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
15	<p>March 13, 2017</p> <p>The Siksika Nation delivered an "Interim" Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe.</p>	<p>Wetlands (sloughs)</p>	<p>Concerns expressed related to the protection of off-river sloughs as animals and fish in and around the Elbow River rely on the sloughs.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Siksika Nation about off-river sloughs will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project would result in the loss of 8 ha of estimated high value wetland area and 13 ha of moderate wetland area in the local assessment area. Approximately 312 ha of the local assessment area contains wetland cover types. No vegetation and wetland land units are completely lost, and therefore no significant effects on vegetation and wetlands are predicted. Effects to wetlands are assessed in the EIA in Volumes 3A and 3B section 10.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>. Alberta Transportation further explained that wetlands are replaced and compensated for under the current Alberta Wetland Policy.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation said that Alberta Transportation had responded to their concern, but Siksika Nation also expressed desire to do a TUS review for any wetland replacement.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
16	<p>May 20, 2016</p> <p>Siksika Nation Letter to Alberta Transportation (DEMA) in support of their TUS budget request.</p> <p>March 13, 2017</p> <p>The Siksika Nation delivered an "Interim" Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe.</p>	Upstream and downstream effects	<p>Concerns regarding: The Downstream Discharge Channel from the reservoir to the Elbow River;</p> <p>Upstream high bank riparian impacts potentially related to the diversion structure;</p> <p>During flood, downstream seepage concerns; potentially caused by the project and not by normal flooding;</p> <p>Upstream surges when the flood gates are raised.</p> <p>Construction period and In-stream work and potential riparian impacts.</p> <p>Concerns expressed related to upstream and downstream effects.</p>	<p>In a letter dated May 10, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that potential impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Siksika Nation will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Upstream effects as a result of the Project are not anticipated. Some backup of flood water when the diversion structure is in operation is expected, however the backup would reach approximately 500m upstream of the diversion structure. The purpose of the Project is to protect lands and communities downstream. The EIA details the potential effects on all valued components during both construction and dry operations and during a flood.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p> <p>In response to Siksika's additional concerns raised at the April 26, 2018 meeting, Alberta Transportation stated that the Project will help avoid a 2013 situation, but that these issues are out of the scope of this project and questions could be directed to Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP), and Alberta Transportation would forward these concerns to AEP.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation stated they were concerned about the impact to drinking water, in regard to sewage and farm run-off upstream of their reserve.</p> <p>Siksika Nation conditionally approved Alberta Transportation's response, but may request more information from Alberta Transportation as the regulatory process proceeds.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
17	<p>April 26, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p> <p>December 10, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.</p>	Water quality	<p>Expressed concerns about water quality (e.g., methylmercury) and drinking water concerns (e.g., sewage releases).</p> <p>Concerns were raised about water quality after a flood.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Stantec answered that the water is not in the reservoir long enough to exceed problem levels and the water will be drained out before there is a problem.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation noted that SR1 would not treat or have an effect on water quality after a flood.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
18	<p>April 26, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	Flood impacts to reserve	If the Project is built, what will be the change in water volume on the Siksika Nation in the event of a flood?	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained the majority of the flooding on Siksika came from the Bow River. Alberta Transportation said they would identify what percentage of the flood SR1 would have mitigated. Their best guess at the time was around 17%.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
19	<p>April 26, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	Debris	Debris left behind in the reservoir after a flood.	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018, Stantec replied that the management strategy is to leave the debris behind unless it is obstructing the future operation of the structure.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
20	<p>March 13, 2017</p> <p>The Siksika Nation delivered an "Interim" Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe.</p> <p>April 26, 2018</p>	Economic Mitigation	Establish ASAP the following: who will be employed in the development of the proposed project, what community benefits will be available, and what steps will be taken to address and accommodate	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If the Project is approved, Alberta Transportation will follow government procurement policies and procedure with respect to labor, and goods and services. Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible economic opportunities with the Siksika First Nation.	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation said they want to be kept up to date on bidding opportunities. They want their archeologist involved. Siksika Nation also stressed the importance of preferred contracts.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec		future impacts to Siksika interests. Siksika Nation would like preferred contracting for the contract procurement process.	On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> .			
21	August 10, 2016 Site Visit September 15, 2016 Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation at Head Smashed In Buffalo Jump	Historical Resources Monitoring	The Siksika Nation Consultation team expressed an interest in having monitors in place during the construction so that they could observe the work being undertaken and to protect Blackfoot artifacts. Siksika Nation requested front line monitors be present throughout the SR1 construction.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If the Project is approved, Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible monitoring opportunities with the Siksika First Nation. On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> . At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to discuss monitoring opportunities with Siksika Nation.	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation indicated they would develop a plan for monitoring and present it.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
22	April 26, 2018 Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Monitoring	Siksika Nation would like to monitor before and after a flood to understand what is growing in the Project area. Some plants may not grow back. Do not want to over harvest. Transplanting makes sense but would need to assess where suitable habitat is located.	At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to discuss monitoring opportunities with Siksika Nation.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
23	April 26, 2018 Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Land use	Request to hunt and harvest in Area B since it will become Crown land. Siksika Nation would like to explore uses of Area C (leasing options).	At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation put forward their desire to work with Siksika Nation to develop a land use plan that includes access for traditional use.	At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Siksika Nation expressed concerns regarding the viability of the land use plan and indicated they would want to see a land use plan before commenting on it. There were concerns that the Siksika Nation would be asked to consult and then their input would not be used in the final plan, leaving them without access to the landscape. The community mentioned the Grassy Narrows case and the issues around use of the Majorville Medicine Wheel.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
24	March 13, 2017 The Siksika Nation delivered an "Interim" Traditional Use Report that was co-authored with the Blood Tribe.	Site Access	Siksika Nation stated that access was not provided to areas the Siksika Nation wanted to visit.	Alberta Transportation responded in a letter dated May 10, 2017: Alberta Transportation approved all the Siksika Nation budgets for site visits to SR1 and facilitated access to private lands with landowners on all properties the Siksika Nation requested. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation approved all the Siksika Nation budgets	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>for site visits to SR1 and facilitated access to private lands with landowners on all properties the Siksika requested.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p>			
25	<p>January 18, 2017</p> <p>Alberta Transportation meeting with the Siksika Nation, Blood Tribe/Kainai, and Piikani Nation in Lethbridge Alberta.</p>	Indigenous Involvement	<p>Concern that the Blackfoot Nations were not involved in the EIA work.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Stantec responded that they are paying more attention to First Nations, and they want First Nation input on the EIA. The Blackfoot Nations had access to the SR1 lands, and now Alberta Transportation and Stantec want to hear their concerns and the impact to their Treaty rights and traditional uses so they can include these in the EIA.</p> <p>At the meeting held on January 18, 2017, Alberta Transportation also responded that they were undertaking the work in accordance with the requirements of the regulatory process. Alberta Transportation indicated that they did not have the authority to change the regulatory process and if the Piikani Nation wanted to be directly involved in the EIA process they would have to consult provincial agencies such as Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP), Indigenous Relations, and ACT.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation has been engaged with Siksika since 2014 to understand how the Project potentially impacts rights, interests and traditional uses.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided funding to Siksika for a traditional use study. To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 7 site visits by Siksika within the Project Development Area (PDA) over the period between the fall of 2016 to the late summer of 2017.</p> <p>A joint interim TUS report was delivered by Siksika and Kainai First Nation on March 13, 2017. The TUS study was used in the environmental impact assessment (EIA). However, permission to use the spatial information from the TUS study has not been received by AT, therefore the information regarding sites and areas has been generalized for use in the EIA and exact locations, including those in the project development area, are not provided.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent the link to the October 2017 EIS to Siksika on November 3, 2017. On December 5, 2017 Alberta Transportation requested feedback on the TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further indigenous engagement activities.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation provided Siksika with the revised draft TLRU sections for review and comment under correspondence dated February 6, 2018. Alberta Transportation also offered a workshop with the goal of</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation.

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>better understanding potential impacts of the Project to Siksika and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date.</p> <p>A workshop was held with Siksika on February 26, 2018 and was facilitated by CEAA. Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU sections in the EIA have not been updated to include information discussed.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p> <p>On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i>.</p>			
26	December 10, 2018 Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Consultation Involvement	<p>Concerns were raised regarding getting input from the Siksika Nation prior to construction so that areas of concern could be better avoided.</p> <p>Concerns were raised that more departments within Siksika Nation need to be part of this conversation.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
27	October 27, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held in Siksika, Alberta.	Flooding Information sharing	As the Siksika Nation had been severely impacted by the 2013 flood they were concerned and wanted their membership to be informed on the ongoing attempt to mitigate future floods.	<p>At the meeting held on October 27, 2014, Alberta Transportation said they would be willing to undertake a presentation at a public meeting at Siksika.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation agreed to work closely with Siksika to provide a professionally developed article for the Siksika website and newspaper. An article was supplied to the Siksika Media Coordinator on November 6, 2014 for their publication. The article was published in the Siksika newspaper "Aitsiniki" in November 2014 (Volume 21, Issue 8).</p> <p>Alberta Transportation also held a workshop with Siksika members in Calgary on February 26, 2018 to discuss the TLRU section of the EIA, and are working with Siksika to reschedule a workshop on the Siksika reserve.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation consultation team, community members, and Elders December 10, 2018 to discuss the project and Siksika Nation's concerns.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation.
28	October 27, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting held in Siksika, Alberta.	Pipelines	Concerns expressed as to what would happen to the oil/gas pipelines that cross the SR1 site.	<p>At the meeting held on October 27, 2014, Alberta Transportation responded the pipelines would probably be relocated, but at that time the information was not available.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The proposed project development area (PDA) currently contains active pipelines operated by third-parties. As a mitigation measure to reduce the likelihood of a potential pipeline rupture or adverse</p>	At the meeting held on April 26, 2018 to discuss concerns and responses, Siksika Nation stated they would like to do a site visit and monitor if/when pipelines are removed.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	2. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				interaction with the Project, pipelines within the PDA of the off-stream reservoir will be re-located or retrofitted. On April 26, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Siksika Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-5 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Siksika Nation</i> .			
29	December 10, 2018 Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Project selection	Concerns were raised regarding the decision of SR1 over the McLean Creek (MC1) option as a flood protection measure.	At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained why SR1 was chosen over MC1. MC1 would be located on Crown land instead of private land, would have more environmental effects, and the impacts to Treaty rights would be higher.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
30	December 10, 2018 Meeting between Siksika Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Flood protection	There were concerns raised about flood protection along the Bow River in addition to the measures on the Elbow River.	At the meeting held on December 10, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated that flood protection measures were being looked into on the Bow River and that would be a separate project.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

Springbank SR1 - Specific Concerns and Response Table

First Nation or Metis Settlement: **Stoney Nakoda (Bears paw) Nation**

Date: **AUGUST 2014 – FEBRUARY 2019**

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
1	<p>October 20, 2014 Initial Meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations occurred at the Super 8 Hotel in Cochrane AB.</p> <p>May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley.</p> <p>June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation</p>	<p>Stoney Nakoda Nation confirmed the SR1 project is in their traditional territory. They want to be able to complete an internal Cultural Review of the project area with Elders.</p> <p>Bill Snow indicated that Aboriginal Relations policy does not apply to private lands. He also indicated that the Stoney Nakoda Nations will want to undertake a Cultural Assessment of the Springbank Project Area.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda representatives indicated the need to do research in the river valleys, the Bow River was mentioned as one area that the Stoney Nakoda Nations need to do more testing.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation feel a Cultural Use Study, a Stoney Hydrology report, and a wildlife impacts study are required.</p>	<p>Cultural Resources Traditional Use Studies</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Stoney Nakoda Nations to conduct a Traditional Use Study (TUS) on the project lands (privately held). The Stoney Nakoda Nations conducted a TUS (11 field days) in the fall of 2016. The TUS report has not been received as of February 28, 2019. The TUS would have been used to inform the Traditional Land and Resource Use (TLRU) section of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) had it been received prior to submission.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations have not submitted a budget for a hydrology or wildlife study.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation has been engaged with Stoney Nakoda Nation since 2014 to understand how the Project potentially impacts rights, interests and traditional uses.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided funding for the Stoney Nakoda Bears paw, Chiniki, Wesley Nations to conduct a Traditional Use Study on the project lands. No report has been received to date, March 16, 2018.</p> <p>To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 11 site visits by Stoney Nakoda Nations within the Project Development Area (PDA) in the fall of 2016.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent the link to the October 2017 EIA to Stoney Nakoda Nation on November 3, 2017. On December 5, 2017, Alberta Transportation requested feedback on the TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further indigenous engagement activities.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation provided Stoney Nakoda Nations with the revised draft TLRU sections for review and comment under correspondence dated February 6, 2018. Alberta Transportation also offered a workshop with the goal of better understanding potential impacts of the Project to Stoney Nakoda Nations and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date.</p> <p>A workshop was held with Stoney Nakoda Nation on February 12, 2018, and was facilitated by Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA). Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU sections in the EIA have not been updated to include information discussed. A second workshop is planned for March 20, 2018.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations explained that they are currently being engaged on over 500 active projects and therefore capacity continues to be an issue for Stoney Nakoda Nations. They have done the site visits but have not written the report. The TUS is currently underway. Stoney Nakoda Nations is considering what additional work may be required.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they would submit what they would like to do and where they would like to visit.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would not be submitting a TUS report or related budgets.</p>	<p>Stoney Nakoda Nations will not be submitting further budgets and no reports or studies are expected.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to assist in arranging land access if Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to undertake another site visit. Alberta Transportation also indicated that Stoney Nakoda Nations could submit a budget for further work.			
2	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Indicated desire to do a site visit with elders.	Site visits	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation explained they do not have access to the SR1 lands, and access will have to be requested on an owner by owner basis. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: At the time of the request Alberta Transportation's agreement with the landowners for access had expired. Any additional access would need to be requested on an owner by owner basis. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to assist in arranging land access if Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to undertake another site visit. Alberta Transportation also indicated that Stoney Nakoda Nations could submit a budget for further work.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, the Stoney Nakoda Nations consultation team said they would speak with Elders to determine which areas to visit or revisit. Stoney Nakoda Nations said they would submit what they would like to do and where they would like to visit. At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would likely not be submitting a budget or a TUS report.		Ongoing: Working with First Nation
3	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	The Stoney Nakoda would like to mark the importance of the cultural assessment and place animal and plant studies into one cultural assessment as these topics relate to certain stories and wildlife behaviour. This relates to using cultural studies to look at animals and plant instead of relying only on scientific techniques.	Cultural assessment	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
4	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	The Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns to their Treaty Rights and traditional uses of lands in the Project area. Concerns were expressed for the Stoney Nakoda cultural practices, their current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, the effect on water and wetlands for wildlife, fish, birds and vegetation.	Treaty and Traditional Rights Wildlife Fish Vegetation Wetlands	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights are addressed through the assessment of the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. By acknowledging a link between practice-based rights and current use, this assessment accepts that adverse residual effects on availability of traditional resources for current use, on access to traditional resources or areas for current use, or on sites or areas for current use will have a consequent effect on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Given that the residual effects for the Project on TLRU are predicted to be not significant, no effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights is expected to occur as a result of the Project. In addition, a conservative assumption was made that Indigenous groups had access to the PDA to practice traditional use activities notwithstanding access to these private lands is limited.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations did not completely agree with the response, explaining that the lands that are available for traditional land and resource use are getting smaller and smaller over the years. This is a cumulative effect and habitat replacement is important. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that an effect on wildlife results in an effect on Treaty rights.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
5	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley.	The Stoney Nakoda representatives spoke of doing a ceremony in the SR1 project area.	Ceremony	Alberta Transportation response in table set March 23, 2018: At the request of Indigenous groups, Alberta Transportation will participate in ceremonies (if invited) prior to the start of construction, including making offerings.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will confirm with CEAA regarding funding for holding a ceremony.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
6	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Dallas Maynard and Bill Snow at Starbucks, West Hills Shopping Centre	Bill Snow discussed the Stoney Nakoda Nations funding from CEAA and the desire for their Consultation team and elders to undertake a ceremony on the SR1 lands. Bill explained the Stoney had a long-standing relationship with Mary Robinson's family. They wanted Alberta Transportation and CEAA to participate.	Ceremony	Alberta Transportation agreed to a meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations on September 14, 2017, which included CEAA, to discuss and work with the Stoney Nakoda Nation to respond to their requests. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: At the request of Indigenous groups, Alberta Transportation will participate in ceremonies (if invited) prior to the start of construction, including making offerings. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated that if Stoney Nakoda Nations required funding for a ceremony to submit a budget to Alberta Transportation.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will confirm with CEAA regarding funding for holding a ceremony. Stoney Nakoda Nations will reach out to a landowner to access their land in order to view some sites; Stoney Nakoda Nations' preference is to perform a ceremony pre-construction on or near their land as well, as there are tipi rings and sites present on the property.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
7	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley. January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Stated there are two different trap lines out there and their members use the area for trapping but did not specify their location. EIA reflects existence of at least two Stoney Nakoda traplines in project area, loss of harvesting opportunities will have to be compensated	Hunting	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Based on available information there are no registered traplines within the PDA. Alberta Transportation has requested the locations of the two traplines and were the Stoney members trap in order to determine if there is potential impact from the Project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations confirmed that the traplines are located west of Bragg Creek and there are no active traplines in the Project area.	No further mitigation required as the traplines are not in the project area and will not be affected.	No further action required.
8	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley. February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Asked if the SR1 project would include any wildlife crossings, and also inquired about fencing. Emphasized the importance of wildlife crossings and was concerned that if not properly managed could be a problem for the SR1 project.	Wildlife	At the meeting held on May 4, 2016, Alberta Transportation responded that the SR1 diversion channels and the earthen dam would be designed to allow the passage of wildlife along the Elbow River. Alberta Transportation responded that there will likely be some fencing on the SR1 Project. Alberta Transportation response in table set March 23, 2018: Although the Project would result in additional anthropogenic features on the landscape that might hinder wildlife movement in the local assessment area, Alberta Transportation has made adjustments to accommodate wildlife movement such as revegetating the floodplain berm with materials conducive for ungulate movement. The EIA concluded that the project residual effects on wildlife movement are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species, including species at risk (EIA, Volume 3A and 3B section 11). At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.	Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns that wildlife will not adapt to the new land configurations. Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques. At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>		
9	<p>September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.</p> <p>February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.</p>	<p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns over wildlife passage through the SR1 area following construction. Inquired if there would be wildlife crossings built over HWY 22 or Highway 8.</p> <p>There is a concern with the lack of wildlife corridors and that the project will impact wildlife movement. Wildlife need space and the option to travel the corridors. This goes back to Elder memories because how the animals use the land today is similar to how they used the land in the past.</p>	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that there was no plan to build wildlife overpasses. Alberta Transportation indicated that the diversion channel and dam were contoured to allow for wildlife passage through the SR1 area during non-flood times.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no plan to build wildlife overpasses. The diversion channel and dam were contoured to allow for wildlife passage through the SR1 area during non-flood times. The channel will be directed under HWY 22 and Township Road 242. The area underneath the bridges will contain rip rap however, the rip rap under the bridges will be filled with gravel potentially enabling animals to move under the bridges and avoid crossing the roads.</p> <p>With respect to Project design, the side slopes and bottom of the diversion channel will be vegetated, with the following exceptions. Where the diversion channel passes through bedrock, the channel would remain as an exposed bedrock cut. Articulated concrete matting will be provided in select areas of the channel where pipelines cross. Riprap erosion protection will be provided at critical areas including at bridge crossings, around the emergency spillway and for a 1.4 km stretch at the diversion channel outlet structure. The south portion, farthest from Elbow River, will be a 450-m earthen embankment vegetated with native grasses. The floodplain berm will also be covered with materials conducive to ungulate movement (see Volume 3A, Section 11).</p> <p>A remote camera program will be designed in consultation with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP), to identify whether the diversion channel acts as a barrier to wildlife movement during dry operations, especially for ungulates, and determine the effectiveness of mitigation implemented throughout the diversion channel. The remote camera program will also include monitoring along the Elbow River to determine if wildlife use of the Key Wildlife and Biodiversity Zone (KWBZ) has been affected by the construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed ongoing concerns with infrastructure affecting wildlife passage and recommend the consideration of wildlife crossings, including overpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations continued to express concerns related to wildlife movement through the project area.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>			
10	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns that the fences that would be built around the SR1 site might impact wildlife passage through the area.	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation explained the fences that were planned for the SR1 project would be similar to the farm fencing that already exists and should not have any additional impact to wildlife than currently exists.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Fences that are planned for the SR1 project would be similar to the farm fencing that already exists and should not have any additional impact to wildlife than currently exists.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that this type of fencing should be okay for wildlife.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. Alberta Transportation will be using wildlife friendly fencing around the SR1 boundary that will allow wildlife to move under and over.	No further action required.
11	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	Concern that there is a lack of long-term wildlife studies on the cumulative impacts the SR1 project would have to wildlife. These studies should address animal movement in the area.	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist, who explained there is a monitoring program planned with wildlife cameras to monitor long-term cumulative effects of the project on wildlife.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations continued to express concerns related to wildlife movement through the project area, and said wildlife cameras do not catch everything.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
12	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	Concerns that the SR1 project will act as a barrier to the migration of wildlife and fish. Concerns over the lack of wildlife crossings on the SR1 project.	Wildlife Fish	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Stoney Nakoda Nation (wildlife and fish) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Although the Project would result in additional anthropogenic features on the landscape that might hinder wildlife movement in the local assessment area, Alberta Transportation has made adjustments to accommodate wildlife movement such as revegetating the floodplain berm with materials conducive for ungulate movement. The EIA concluded that the project residual effects on</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concern about fish returning to the habitat once the coffer dam (used during construction) has been removed.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda Nations consultation team will discuss fish species of importance (including mountain whitefish, cutthroat, and bull trout) during the next</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>wildlife movement are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species, including species at risk (EIA, Volume 3A and 3B section 11).</p> <p>During Project design it was recognized that the diversion structure could result in an increase in flow rates of the Elbow River at the structure and potentially affect the ability of fish to pass upstream. In order to avoid affecting fish passage design elements were incorporated to ensure that under normal river conditions flow rates are maintained within the range suitable for fish passage.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec explained that fish can pass through the diversion structure during dry conditions and flood conditions. Stantec showed an engineering diagram of the reservoir and how it would affect fish. They also showed berms that will be installed to control the water speed and allow fish to move upstream.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>	<p>Elder's meeting to understand potential effects and mitigation better.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations and Alberta Transportation discussed habitat replacement and confirmed that it will be replaced and this will be directed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO).</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations requested that a discussion be held with Alberta Transportation regarding alternative options for fish salvage, beyond electrofishing.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>		
13	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	Concerns expressed that the proposed SR1 project will drive away or minimize the availability of birds, fish, and wildlife.	Wildlife Fish	Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Stoney Nakoda Nation (wildlife and fish) will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in direct and indirect loss of wildlife habitat during construction and dry operations; however, the amount of wildlife habitat permanently affected (168 ha) is relatively small compared to the availability of wildlife habitat remaining in the local assessment area (4,860 ha). Although there would be temporary displacement and disturbance to wildlife during construction, a measurable change in the abundance of wildlife in the regional assessment area is unlikely.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
14	June 4, 2018	Concerned that the rate of stabilization for fish will take	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec explained there would be a disruption and habitat loss in that area. Alberta Transportation will engineer	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	longer than the expected three years and it will take a long time for them to acclimate to the conditions post-construction.		rocks/berms to give the fish areas of shelter. Stantec explained they would design the structure to ensure the fish have proper water speed and depth to move up-river.			
15	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	Native fish species (mountain white fish, bull trout and cutthroat trout) should be included in the discussion on fish and fish habitat. These are species that First Nations traditionally subsided on and lands in SR1 were used as camping spots to access these fish resources. In addition, the Stony Nakoda are noticing a decrease in water levels which will have a further impact on fish habitat.	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec went over the fish species they found in the Elbow River and the proportion of each in different sections of the river.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will discuss the topic at their next Elders meeting.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
16	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	There is a concern using electrofishing and that fish will die during relocation. Stoney Nakoda Nations would like Alberta Transportation to explore other ways of retrieving and relocating the stranded fish.	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation said they will look at methods of capturing fish and note the concern with electrofishing.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
17	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency September 13, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations and Alberta Transportation	The Stoney Nakoda Nation was concerned about the hydrology of the SR1 area. In particular cited the Elbow River vs. groundwater impacts.	Hydrology	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA considered the effects of the Project on both surface water (Volume 3A and 3B, section 6) and groundwater, including the Alluvial Aquifer (Volumes 3A and 3B, section 5, Appendix 1). The assessment used a complex numerical groundwater model (FEFLOW) to evaluate potential changes to the hydrogeologic system, including aquifer pressure, caused by floods and construction and operation of the Project. The results of a series of the modeling scenarios showed that the groundwater levels and flow patterns are altered within the vicinity of the proposed Project. Changes are observed within the reservoir area during flooding and recede toward pre-flood conditions following floods. Changes in the groundwater flow regime are also observed along the proposed diversion channel. The model results were used as the basis for the EIA. The assessment concluded that effects to groundwater quantity and quality would not be significant. The residual effects on groundwater quantity from the Project are assessed as not significant because they would not decrease the yield of groundwater supply wells to the point where they can no longer be used. The residual	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated this concern was raised by the consultation officer for Chiniki First Nation. Stoney Nakoda Nations will provide the hydrology summary (from the EIA Summary) to Chiniki First Nation to confirm whether this response addresses the concern.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>effects on groundwater quality from the Project are assessed as not significant because changes in groundwater quality at existing wells would not deteriorate to the point where it becomes non-potable or cannot meet the Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality for a consecutive period exceeding 30 days (for those parameters which don't already, under existing conditions, exceed those guidelines). Effects to groundwater would be limited to the local assessment area.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec showed figures to help explain the hydrology of the SR1 project area. Alberta Transportation also explained that the natural clay till cap would act as a natural barrier and not allow flood water to mix with groundwater.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation responded that hydrology information had been shared in Sections 3A and 3B of the EIA. Alberta Transportation committed to providing the EIA material again.</p> <p>In an email on October 24, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided a link to a FTP site with the March 2018 EIA.</p>			
18	<p>September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4. February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	<p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation was concerned that Crown land should be set aside to replace lands taken for SR1.</p> <p>There is a concern from the Stoney Nakoda Nation that the land they can practise Aboriginal Treaty Rights on is getting smaller with an increase in development. This has an impact on Aboriginal Rights.</p> <p>There is a concern that the SR1 area was used in the past for traditional activities, such as hunting, and camping and that this activity would be permanently altered by the Project.</p>	Land replacement	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that any wetlands impacted would be replaced however the overall SR1 lands would not be replaced.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If approved, the project requires the acquisition of private land. Landowners would be provided monetary compensation. These private lands will not be replaced.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained there will be more land access through the eastern area of the project area and this is a grazing lease.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation presented on the proposed land use plan in which Stoney Nakoda Nations could participate.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations requested a discussion regarding compensation for the loss of access to Crown lands, since the Project area will become Crown land once it is purchased from private land owners.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
19	February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Stoney Nakoda Nation is interested in participating in monitoring programs.	Monitoring	At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation committed to continued discussions on monitoring.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
20	October 20, 2014 Initial Meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations occurred at	Inquired about the oil pipelines that cross the SR1 lands and what would happen to them as part of SR1.	Pipelines	<p>At the meeting held on October 20, 2014, Alberta Transportation responded the oil pipelines would likely be relocated, but at the time that information was not available.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific</i></p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns about emergency preparedness. Stoney Nakoda Nations requests reassurance that there will be	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>the Super 8 Hotel in Cochrane AB.</p> <p>February 22, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>			<p><i>Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The procedures for dealing with overhead and buried utilities located within constructions zones is highly regulated. All regulatory requirements will be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>Oil and gas pipelines operated by four companies (TransCanada Pipelines Ltd., Pengrowth Energy Corp., Veresen Inc., and Plains Midstream Canada) are located within the diversion channel, dam, and reservoir areas.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation are currently in contact with these utility owners and crossing agreements will be developed. Buried pipeline and overhead utilities will be relocated, moved or lowered as required. Prior to any soil disturbance, utility locate sweeps will be done and buried lines and pipelines will be flagged and marked. Pipeline crossings will be designed and maintained as required by the utility owners and in strict compliance with regulations. Daily hazard assessments will be conducted before work is undertaken in the vicinity of utilities. In the event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address pipeline emergency response. The implementation preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>In the unlikely event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address and coordinate the emergency response. The implementation of preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation showed a map with the current pipelines within the project area, what is in them, who owns them, and what would happen to them if the Project is approved. It was confirmed there was no sour gas in any of the lines. Alberta Transportation committed to looking into mercaptans.</p>	<p>an emergency response plan in place and that the regulator(s) will manage the response in the event of an incident, spill, release, etc. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that a communication plan needs to be part of the response plan.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation voiced concerns regarding any mercaptans that may have been added to the contents of the pipelines around the SR1 Project.</p>		
21	<p>June 4, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.</p> <p>February 22, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	<p>There is a concern with emergency response preparedness and how emergencies would be communicated to the Stoney Nakoda Nations (specifically for pipelines and utility lines).</p>	<p>Pipelines and utility lines</p> <p>Emergency response</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation said they will get information on what pipelines and utility lines are in the area and who owns the lines. Alberta Transportation will review whether the regulator is AUC or the AER and investigate the emergency response plans of the utility companies.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation indicated the emergency response plans for pipelines were the responsibility of the pipeline owners.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns about general emergency response planning, including with regards to pipelines.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with the First Nation</p>
22	<p>January 15, 2017</p> <p>Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations</p>	<p>Questions about location of Calgary/Morleyville Trail, and if Alberta considers it a pre-existing trail prior to 1877 then an allowance for a right-of-way through the Proposed</p>	<p>Historic Trails</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
		Development Area will have to be provided for.					
23	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns with the Stoney lack of mapping capability and requested some assistance understanding the SR1 mapping.	Mapping	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation agreed to provide a PDF and Google KMZ map of the test bore holes that Stantec completed during the site investigation phase at the SR1 project. Maps of the test bore hole locations were sent to Stoney Nakoda Nations September 17, 2017. In an email on October 6, 2017, Alberta Transportation recommended a company capable of doing GIS (geographic information system) mapping, and offered to look into what GIS data Stantec had that could be shared. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation provided a PDF and Google KMZ map of the test Bore holes completed during the site investigation phase at the SR1 project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations confirmed they had received the test bore hole location maps sent by Alberta Transportation.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. The maps were provided to Stoney Nakoda Nations.	No further action required.
24	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Transportation has used incorrect maps of Stoney IR 142, 143, 144.	Mapping of Stoney IR 142, 143, 144.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA has been updated to use the correct maps of the Stoney Nakoda Nation Reserves 142, 143, 144. The map was sourced from the Natural Resources Canada, Lands and Minerals Sector – Geobase http://ftp.geogratis.gc.ca/pub/nrcan_rncan/vector/geobase_al_ta/	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the updated maps of IR 142, 143, and 144, included in the March 2018 EIA responded to the concern. The maps were included in the updated EIA.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. The maps of IR 142, 143, and 144 were corrected in the March 2018 EIA.	No further action required.
25	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Provide map of location of traditional territory of Stoney Nakoda	Traditional territory	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA provides a description of the Stoney Nakoda traditional territory from source - SIB 2014: Amended Statement of Claim, Court File Number 0301-19586. This amended statement of claim was prepared and filed by Stoney Nakoda Nations in the context of Action Number 0301-19586. This source was used to provide background information for Stoney Nakoda Nations, including information on the traditional territory. The scope of the identified traditional territory is one of the issues in dispute in the context of this litigation.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that this responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.
26	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Dallas Maynard and Bill Snow at Starbucks, West Hills Shopping Centre	Bill Snow explained there have recently been elections within the Stoney Nakoda Nations and he would like to request that Alberta Transportation organize a presentation on the SR1 to update their Chiefs and CAOs on SR1.	Information sharing	Alberta Transportation followed up November 10, 2017 asking if Stoney Nakoda Nation were still interested in having a presentation for the newly elected officials and received no response. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation presented the SR1 Project to the Stoney Nakoda Nation at the Stoney Nakoda Resort on February 12, 2018. A further workshop at the Stoney Nakoda Resort has been scheduled for February 20, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, no further requests have been made by Stoney Nakoda Nation to present to Chief and Council.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
27	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Requested an on-reserve presentation on the SR1 project.	Information sharing	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation said they would inquire about accommodating an on-reserve presentation. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation presented the SR1 Project to the Stoney Nakoda Nation at the Stoney Nakoda Resort on February 12, 2018. A further workshop at the Stoney Nakoda Resort has been scheduled for February 20, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, Alberta Transportation has met with Stoney Nakoda Nations a total of 11 times.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations responded that they will discuss whether this concern has been met with other members of the consultation team.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
28	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Alberta Transporting does not have a good record in accommodating First Nation project concerns or sharing information.	Consultation	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
29	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Minister Mason's comments in June 2018 were inappropriate and is seen as inadequate consultation.	Consultation	At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that consultation with the Stoney Nakoda Nations had begun in October 2014, with multiple meetings and site visits occurring, as well as funding being provided for a TUS.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
30	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Administrative and financial challenges posed by the CEAA funding process, which are embedding additional project administration and financing to First Nations.	Funding	At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation informed Stoney Nakoda Nations that there was money available from their TUS budget, which will be paid once the TUS is received. Alberta Transportation requested a budget for any additional work Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to do. Alberta Transportation again requested a budget for the additional work (another site visit) in an email December 18, 2018 as well as in person on December 19, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, no budget has been received.	At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would not be submitting a TUS report or related budgets.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
31	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	EIA and the project cannot be looked at in isolation from other flood control measures	Project in relation to other flood measures	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Following the floods of June 2013, the government of Alberta assessed various flood mitigation measures as detailed in the Project Location Alternatives section of the Volume 1 Project Description of the EIA. The SR1 Project was selected as the preferred option. In addition, flood mitigation projects for Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows are underway.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations acknowledged this response but did not provide further feedback.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
32	December 9, 2016 Email Comment from Bill Snow, Consultation Manager, Stoney Tribal Government related to receiving notification that that an environmental assessment was being completed at McLean Creek as part of the SR1 project.	In response to the McLean Creek (MC1) option environmental assessment notification, Bill Snow requested that the project designers also include wildlife crossing options into their assessment.	Wildlife	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no intention to complete historical/indigenous impact studies for the MC1 option. An assessment of the MC1 option was included as part of the Project Location Alternatives assessment in the EIA (Volume 1, Section 3, Volume 4, Supporting Documentation). Alberta Transportation is applying for the SR1 Project. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, it was reiterated that the MC1 option was not moving forward.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the response in Table 7-4 responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
33	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Asked when/how historical/indigenous impact studies will be conducted for the McLean Creek option.	McLean Creek	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no intention to complete historical/indigenous impact studies for the MC1 option. An assessment of the MC1 option was included as part of the Project Location Alternatives assessment in the EIA (Volume 1, Section 3, Volume 4, Supporting Documentation). Alberta Transportation is applying for the SR1 Project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the Table 7-4 response on historical/indigenous impact studies responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.

Springbank SR1 - Specific Concerns and Response Table

First Nation or Metis Settlement: **Stoney Nakoda (Chiniki) Nation**

Date: **AUGUST 2014 – FEBRUARY 2019**

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
1	<p>October 20, 2014 Initial Meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations occurred at the Super 8 Hotel in Cochrane AB.</p> <p>May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley.</p> <p>June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation</p>	<p>Stoney Nakoda Nation confirmed the SR1 project is in their traditional territory. They want to be able to complete an internal Cultural Review of the project area with Elders.</p> <p>Bill Snow indicated that Aboriginal Relations policy does not apply to private lands. He also indicated that the Stoney Nakoda Nations will want to undertake a Cultural Assessment of the Springbank Project Area.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda representatives indicated the need to do research in the river valleys, the Bow River was mentioned as one area that the Stoney Nakoda Nations need to do more testing.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation feel a Cultural Use Study, a Stoney Hydrology report, and a wildlife impacts study are required.</p>	<p>Cultural Resources</p> <p>Traditional Use Studies</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Stoney Nakoda Nations to conduct a Traditional Use Study (TUS) on the project lands (privately held). The Stoney Nakoda Nations conducted a TUS (11 field days) in the fall of 2016. The TUS report has not been received as of February 28, 2019. The TUS would have been used to inform the Traditional Land and Resource Use (TLRU) section of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) had it been received prior to submission.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations have not submitted a budget for a hydrology or wildlife study.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation has been engaged with Stoney Nakoda Nation since 2014 to understand how the Project potentially impacts rights, interests and traditional uses.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided funding for the Stoney Nakoda Bears paw, Chiniki, Wesley Nations to conduct a Traditional Use Study on the project lands. No report has been received to date, March 16, 2018.</p> <p>To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 11 site visits by Stoney Nakoda Nations within the Project Development Area (PDA) in the fall of 2016.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent the link to the October 2017 EIA to Stoney Nakoda Nation on November 3, 2017. On December 5, 2017, Alberta Transportation requested feedback on the TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further indigenous engagement activities.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation provided Stoney Nakoda Nations with the revised draft TLRU sections for review and comment under correspondence dated February 6, 2018. Alberta Transportation also offered a workshop with the goal of better understanding potential impacts of the Project to Stoney Nakoda Nations and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date.</p> <p>A workshop was held with Stoney Nakoda Nation on February 12, 2018, and was facilitated by Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA). Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU sections in the EIA have not been updated to include information discussed. A second workshop is planned for March 20, 2018.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations explained that they are currently being engaged on over 500 active projects and therefore capacity continues to be an issue for Stoney Nakoda Nations. They have done the site visits but have not written the report. The TUS is currently underway. Stoney Nakoda Nations is considering what additional work may be required.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they would submit what they would like to do and where they would like to visit.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would not be submitting a TUS report or related budgets.</p>	<p>Stoney Nakoda Nations will not be submitting further budgets and no reports or studies are expected.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to assist in arranging land access if Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to undertake another site visit. Alberta Transportation also indicated that Stoney Nakoda Nations could submit a budget for further work.			
2	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Indicated desire to do a site visit with elders.	Site visits	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation explained they do not have access to the SR1 lands, and access will have to be requested on an owner by owner basis. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: At the time of the request Alberta Transportation's agreement with the landowners for access had expired. Any additional access would need to be requested on an owner by owner basis. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to assist in arranging land access if Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to undertake another site visit. Alberta Transportation also indicated that Stoney Nakoda Nations could submit a budget for further work.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, the Stoney Nakoda Nations consultation team said they would speak with Elders to determine which areas to visit or revisit. Stoney Nakoda Nations said they would submit what they would like to do and where they would like to visit. At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would likely not be submitting a budget or a TUS report.		Ongoing: Working with First Nation
3	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	The Stoney Nakoda would like to mark the importance of the cultural assessment and place animal and plant studies into one cultural assessment as these topics relate to certain stories and wildlife behaviour. This relates to using cultural studies to look at animals and plant instead of relying only on scientific techniques.	Cultural assessment	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
4	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	The Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns to their Treaty Rights and traditional uses of lands in the Project area. Concerns were expressed for the Stoney Nakoda cultural practices, their current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, the effect on water and wetlands for wildlife, fish, birds and vegetation.	Treaty and Traditional Rights Wildlife Fish Vegetation Wetlands	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights are addressed through the assessment of the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. By acknowledging a link between practice-based rights and current use, this assessment accepts that adverse residual effects on availability of traditional resources for current use, on access to traditional resources or areas for current use, or on sites or areas for current use will have a consequent effect on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Given that the residual effects for the Project on TLRU are predicted to be not significant, no effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights is expected to occur as a result of the Project. In addition, a conservative assumption was made that Indigenous groups had access to the PDA to practice traditional use activities notwithstanding access to these private lands is limited.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations did not completely agree with the response, explaining that the lands that are available for traditional land and resource use are getting smaller and smaller over the years. This is a cumulative effect and habitat replacement is important. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that an effect on wildlife results in an effect on Treaty rights.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
5	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley.	The Stoney Nakoda representatives spoke of doing a ceremony in the SR1 project area.	Ceremony	Alberta Transportation response in table set March 23, 2018: At the request of Indigenous groups, Alberta Transportation will participate in ceremonies (if invited) prior to the start of construction, including making offerings.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will confirm with CEAA regarding funding for holding a ceremony.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
6	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Dallas Maynard and Bill Snow at Starbucks, West Hills Shopping Centre	Bill Snow discussed the Stoney Nakoda Nations funding from CEAA and the desire for their Consultation team and elders to undertake a ceremony on the SR1 lands. Bill explained the Stoney had a long-standing relationship with Mary Robinson's family. They wanted Alberta Transportation and CEAA to participate.	Ceremony	Alberta Transportation agreed to a meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations on September 14, 2017, which included CEAA, to discuss and work with the Stoney Nakoda Nation to respond to their requests. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: At the request of Indigenous groups, Alberta Transportation will participate in ceremonies (if invited) prior to the start of construction, including making offerings. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated that if Stoney Nakoda Nations required funding for a ceremony to submit a budget to Alberta Transportation.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will confirm with CEAA regarding funding for holding a ceremony. Stoney Nakoda Nations will reach out to a landowner to access their land in order to view some sites; Stoney Nakoda Nations' preference is to perform a ceremony pre-construction on or near their land as well, as there are tipi rings and sites present on the property.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
7	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley. January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Stated there are two different trap lines out there and their members use the area for trapping but did not specify their location. EIA reflects existence of at least two Stoney Nakoda traplines in project area, loss of harvesting opportunities will have to be compensated	Hunting	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Based on available information there are no registered traplines within the PDA. Alberta Transportation has requested the locations of the two traplines and were the Stoney members trap in order to determine if there is potential impact from the Project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations confirmed that the traplines are located west of Bragg Creek and there are no active traplines in the Project area.	No further mitigation required as the traplines are not in the project area and will not be affected.	No further action required.
8	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley. February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Asked if the SR1 project would include any wildlife crossings, and also inquired about fencing. Emphasized the importance of wildlife crossings and was concerned that if not properly managed could be a problem for the SR1 project.	Wildlife	At the meeting held on May 4, 2016, Alberta Transportation responded that the SR1 diversion channels and the earthen dam would be designed to allow the passage of wildlife along the Elbow River. Alberta Transportation responded that there will likely be some fencing on the SR1 Project. Alberta Transportation response in table set March 23, 2018: Although the Project would result in additional anthropogenic features on the landscape that might hinder wildlife movement in the local assessment area, Alberta Transportation has made adjustments to accommodate wildlife movement such as revegetating the floodplain berm with materials conducive for ungulate movement. The EIA concluded that the project residual effects on wildlife movement are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species, including species at risk (EIA, Volume 3A and 3B section 11). At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.	Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns that wildlife will not adapt to the new land configurations. Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques. At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>		
9	<p>September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.</p> <p>February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.</p>	<p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns over wildlife passage through the SR1 area following construction. Inquired if there would be wildlife crossings built over HWY 22 or Highway 8.</p> <p>There is a concern with the lack of wildlife corridors and that the project will impact wildlife movement. Wildlife need space and the option to travel the corridors. This goes back to Elder memories because how the animals use the land today is similar to how they used the land in the past.</p>	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that there was no plan to build wildlife overpasses. Alberta Transportation indicated that the diversion channel and dam were contoured to allow for wildlife passage through the SR1 area during non-flood times.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no plan to build wildlife overpasses. The diversion channel and dam were contoured to allow for wildlife passage through the SR1 area during non-flood times. The channel will be directed under HWY 22 and Township Road 242. The area underneath the bridges will contain rip rap however, the rip rap under the bridges will be filled with gravel potentially enabling animals to move under the bridges and avoid crossing the roads.</p> <p>With respect to Project design, the side slopes and bottom of the diversion channel will be vegetated, with the following exceptions. Where the diversion channel passes through bedrock, the channel would remain as an exposed bedrock cut. Articulated concrete matting will be provided in select areas of the channel where pipelines cross. Riprap erosion protection will be provided at critical areas including at bridge crossings, around the emergency spillway and for a 1.4 km stretch at the diversion channel outlet structure. The south portion, farthest from Elbow River, will be a 450-m earthen embankment vegetated with native grasses. The floodplain berm will also be covered with materials conducive to ungulate movement (see Volume 3A, Section 11).</p> <p>A remote camera program will be designed in consultation with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP), to identify whether the diversion channel acts as a barrier to wildlife movement during dry operations, especially for ungulates, and determine the effectiveness of mitigation implemented throughout the diversion channel. The remote camera program will also include monitoring along the Elbow River to determine if wildlife use of the Key Wildlife and Biodiversity Zone (KWBZ) has been affected by the construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed ongoing concerns with infrastructure affecting wildlife passage and recommend the consideration of wildlife crossings, including overpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations continued to express concerns related to wildlife movement through the project area.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>			
10	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns that the fences that would be built around the SR1 site might impact wildlife passage through the area.	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation explained the fences that were planned for the SR1 project would be similar to the farm fencing that already exists and should not have any additional impact to wildlife than currently exists.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Fences that are planned for the SR1 project would be similar to the farm fencing that already exists and should not have any additional impact to wildlife than currently exists.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that this type of fencing should be okay for wildlife.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. Alberta Transportation will be using wildlife friendly fencing around the SR1 boundary that will allow wildlife to move under and over.	No further action required.
11	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	Concern that there is a lack of long-term wildlife studies on the cumulative impacts the SR1 project would have to wildlife. These studies should address animal movement in the area.	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist, who explained there is a monitoring program planned with wildlife cameras to monitor long-term cumulative effects of the project on wildlife.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations continued to express concerns related to wildlife movement through the project area, and said wildlife cameras do not catch everything.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
12	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	Concerns that the SR1 project will act as a barrier to the migration of wildlife and fish. Concerns over the lack of wildlife crossings on the SR1 project.	Wildlife Fish	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Stoney Nakoda Nation (wildlife and fish) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Although the Project would result in additional anthropogenic features on the landscape that might hinder wildlife movement in the local assessment area, Alberta Transportation has made adjustments to accommodate wildlife movement such as revegetating the floodplain berm with materials conducive for ungulate movement. The EIA concluded that the project residual effects on</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concern about fish returning to the habitat once the coffer dam (used during construction) has been removed.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda Nations consultation team will discuss fish species of importance (including mountain whitefish, cutthroat, and bull trout) during the next</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>wildlife movement are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species, including species at risk (EIA, Volume 3A and 3B section 11).</p> <p>During Project design it was recognized that the diversion structure could result in an increase in flow rates of the Elbow River at the structure and potentially affect the ability of fish to pass upstream. In order to avoid affecting fish passage design elements were incorporated to ensure that under normal river conditions flow rates are maintained within the range suitable for fish passage.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec explained that fish can pass through the diversion structure during dry conditions and flood conditions. Stantec showed an engineering diagram of the reservoir and how it would affect fish. They also showed berms that will be installed to control the water speed and allow fish to move upstream.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>	<p>Elder's meeting to understand potential effects and mitigation better.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations and Alberta Transportation discussed habitat replacement and confirmed that it will be replaced and this will be directed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO).</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations requested that a discussion be held with Alberta Transportation regarding alternative options for fish salvage, beyond electrofishing.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>		
13	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	Concerns expressed that the proposed SR1 project will drive away or minimize the availability of birds, fish, and wildlife.	Wildlife Fish	Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Stoney Nakoda Nation (wildlife and fish) will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in direct and indirect loss of wildlife habitat during construction and dry operations; however, the amount of wildlife habitat permanently affected (168 ha) is relatively small compared to the availability of wildlife habitat remaining in the local assessment area (4,860 ha). Although there would be temporary displacement and disturbance to wildlife during construction, a measurable change in the abundance of wildlife in the regional assessment area is unlikely.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
14	June 4, 2018	Concerned that the rate of stabilization for fish will take	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec explained there would be a disruption and habitat loss in that area. Alberta Transportation will engineer	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	longer than the expected three years and it will take a long time for them to acclimate to the conditions post-construction.		rocks/berms to give the fish areas of shelter. Stantec explained they would design the structure to ensure the fish have proper water speed and depth to move up-river.			
15	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	Native fish species (mountain white fish, bull trout and cutthroat trout) should be included in the discussion on fish and fish habitat. These are species that First Nations traditionally subsided on and lands in SR1 were used as camping spots to access these fish resources. In addition, the Stony Nakoda are noticing a decrease in water levels which will have a further impact on fish habitat.	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec went over the fish species they found in the Elbow River and the proportion of each in different sections of the river.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will discuss the topic at their next Elders meeting.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
16	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	There is a concern using electrofishing and that fish will die during relocation. Stoney Nakoda Nations would like Alberta Transportation to explore other ways of retrieving and relocating the stranded fish.	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation said they will look at methods of capturing fish and note the concern with electrofishing.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
17	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency September 13, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations and Alberta Transportation	The Stoney Nakoda Nation was concerned about the hydrology of the SR1 area. In particular cited the Elbow River vs. groundwater impacts.	Hydrology	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA considered the effects of the Project on both surface water (Volume 3A and 3B, section 6) and groundwater, including the Alluvial Aquifer (Volumes 3A and 3B, section 5, Appendix 1). The assessment used a complex numerical groundwater model (FEFLOW) to evaluate potential changes to the hydrogeologic system, including aquifer pressure, caused by floods and construction and operation of the Project. The results of a series of the modeling scenarios showed that the groundwater levels and flow patterns are altered within the vicinity of the proposed Project. Changes are observed within the reservoir area during flooding and recede toward pre-flood conditions following floods. Changes in the groundwater flow regime are also observed along the proposed diversion channel. The model results were used as the basis for the EIA. The assessment concluded that effects to groundwater quantity and quality would not be significant. The residual effects on groundwater quantity from the Project are assessed as not significant because they would not decrease the yield of groundwater supply wells to the point where they can no longer be used. The residual	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated this concern was raised by the consultation officer for Chiniki First Nation. Stoney Nakoda Nations will provide the hydrology summary (from the EIA Summary) to Chiniki First Nation to confirm whether this response addresses the concern.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>effects on groundwater quality from the Project are assessed as not significant because changes in groundwater quality at existing wells would not deteriorate to the point where it becomes non-potable or cannot meet the Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality for a consecutive period exceeding 30 days (for those parameters which don't already, under existing conditions, exceed those guidelines). Effects to groundwater would be limited to the local assessment area.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec showed figures to help explain the hydrology of the SR1 project area. Alberta Transportation also explained that the natural clay till cap would act as a natural barrier and not allow flood water to mix with groundwater.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation responded that hydrology information had been shared in Sections 3A and 3B of the EIA. Alberta Transportation committed to providing the EIA material again.</p> <p>In an email on October 24, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided a link to a FTP site with the March 2018 EIA.</p>			
18	<p>September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4. February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	<p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation was concerned that Crown land should be set aside to replace lands taken for SR1.</p> <p>There is a concern from the Stoney Nakoda Nation that the land they can practise Aboriginal Treaty Rights on is getting smaller with an increase in development. This has an impact on Aboriginal Rights.</p> <p>There is a concern that the SR1 area was used in the past for traditional activities, such as hunting, and camping and that this activity would be permanently altered by the Project.</p>	Land replacement	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that any wetlands impacted would be replaced however the overall SR1 lands would not be replaced.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If approved, the project requires the acquisition of private land. Landowners would be provided monetary compensation. These private lands will not be replaced.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained there will be more land access through the eastern area of the project area and this is a grazing lease.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation presented on the proposed land use plan in which Stoney Nakoda Nations could participate.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations requested a discussion regarding compensation for the loss of access to Crown lands, since the Project area will become Crown land once it is purchased from private land owners.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
19	February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Stoney Nakoda Nation is interested in participating in monitoring programs.	Monitoring	At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation committed to continued discussions on monitoring.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
20	October 20, 2014 Initial Meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations occurred at	Inquired about the oil pipelines that cross the SR1 lands and what would happen to them as part of SR1.	Pipelines	<p>At the meeting held on October 20, 2014, Alberta Transportation responded the oil pipelines would likely be relocated, but at the time that information was not available.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific</i></p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns about emergency preparedness. Stoney Nakoda Nations requests reassurance that there will be	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>the Super 8 Hotel in Cochrane AB.</p> <p>February 22, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>			<p><i>Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The procedures for dealing with overhead and buried utilities located within constructions zones is highly regulated. All regulatory requirements will be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>Oil and gas pipelines operated by four companies (TransCanada Pipelines Ltd., Pengrowth Energy Corp., Veresen Inc., and Plains Midstream Canada) are located within the diversion channel, dam, and reservoir areas.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation are currently in contact with these utility owners and crossing agreements will be developed. Buried pipeline and overhead utilities will be relocated, moved or lowered as required. Prior to any soil disturbance, utility locate sweeps will be done and buried lines and pipelines will be flagged and marked. Pipeline crossings will be designed and maintained as required by the utility owners and in strict compliance with regulations. Daily hazard assessments will be conducted before work is undertaken in the vicinity of utilities. In the event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address pipeline emergency response. The implementation preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>In the unlikely event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address and coordinate the emergency response. The implementation of preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation showed a map with the current pipelines within the project area, what is in them, who owns them, and what would happen to them if the Project is approved. It was confirmed there was no sour gas in any of the lines. Alberta Transportation committed to looking into mercaptans.</p>	<p>an emergency response plan in place and that the regulator(s) will manage the response in the event of an incident, spill, release, etc. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that a communication plan needs to be part of the response plan.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation voiced concerns regarding any mercaptans that may have been added to the contents of the pipelines around the SR1 Project.</p>		
21	<p>June 4, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.</p> <p>February 22, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	<p>There is a concern with emergency response preparedness and how emergencies would be communicated to the Stoney Nakoda Nations (specifically for pipelines and utility lines).</p>	<p>Pipelines and utility lines</p> <p>Emergency response</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation said they will get information on what pipelines and utility lines are in the area and who owns the lines. Alberta Transportation will review whether the regulator is AUC or the AER and investigate the emergency response plans of the utility companies.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation indicated the emergency response plans for pipelines were the responsibility of the pipeline owners.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns about general emergency response planning, including with regards to pipelines.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with the First Nation</p>
22	<p>January 15, 2017</p> <p>Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations</p>	<p>Questions about location of Calgary/Morleyville Trail, and if Alberta considers it a pre-existing trail prior to 1877 then an allowance for a right-of-way through the Proposed</p>	<p>Historic Trails</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
		Development Area will have to be provided for.					
23	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns with the Stoney lack of mapping capability and requested some assistance understanding the SR1 mapping.	Mapping	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation agreed to provide a PDF and Google KMZ map of the test bore holes that Stantec completed during the site investigation phase at the SR1 project. Maps of the test bore hole locations were sent to Stoney Nakoda Nations September 17, 2017. In an email on October 6, 2017, Alberta Transportation recommended a company capable of doing GIS (geographic information system) mapping, and offered to look into what GIS data Stantec had that could be shared. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation provided a PDF and Google KMZ map of the test Bore holes completed during the site investigation phase at the SR1 project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations confirmed they had received the test bore hole location maps sent by Alberta Transportation.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. The maps were provided to Stoney Nakoda Nations.	No further action required.
24	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Transportation has used incorrect maps of Stoney IR 142, 143, 144.	Mapping of Stoney IR 142, 143, 144.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA has been updated to use the correct maps of the Stoney Nakoda Nation Reserves 142, 143, 144. The map was sourced from the Natural Resources Canada, Lands and Minerals Sector – Geobase http://ftp.geogratis.gc.ca/pub/nrcan_rncan/vector/geobase_al_ta/	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the updated maps of IR 142, 143, and 144, included in the March 2018 EIA responded to the concern. The maps were included in the updated EIA.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. The maps of IR 142, 143, and 144 were corrected in the March 2018 EIA.	No further action required.
25	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Provide map of location of traditional territory of Stoney Nakoda	Traditional territory	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA provides a description of the Stoney Nakoda traditional territory from source - SIB 2014: Amended Statement of Claim, Court File Number 0301-19586. This amended statement of claim was prepared and filed by Stoney Nakoda Nations in the context of Action Number 0301-19586. This source was used to provide background information for Stoney Nakoda Nations, including information on the traditional territory. The scope of the identified traditional territory is one of the issues in dispute in the context of this litigation.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that this responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.
26	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Dallas Maynard and Bill Snow at Starbucks, West Hills Shopping Centre	Bill Snow explained there have recently been elections within the Stoney Nakoda Nations and he would like to request that Alberta Transportation organize a presentation on the SR1 to update their Chiefs and CAOs on SR1.	Information sharing	Alberta Transportation followed up November 10, 2017 asking if Stoney Nakoda Nation were still interested in having a presentation for the newly elected officials and received no response. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation presented the SR1 Project to the Stoney Nakoda Nation at the Stoney Nakoda Resort on February 12, 2018. A further workshop at the Stoney Nakoda Resort has been scheduled for February 20, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, no further requests have been made by Stoney Nakoda Nation to present to Chief and Council.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
27	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Requested an on-reserve presentation on the SR1 project.	Information sharing	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation said they would inquire about accommodating an on-reserve presentation. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation presented the SR1 Project to the Stoney Nakoda Nation at the Stoney Nakoda Resort on February 12, 2018. A further workshop at the Stoney Nakoda Resort has been scheduled for February 20, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, Alberta Transportation has met with Stoney Nakoda Nations a total of 11 times.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations responded that they will discuss whether this concern has been met with other members of the consultation team.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
28	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Alberta Transporting does not have a good record in accommodating First Nation project concerns or sharing information.	Consultation	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
29	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Minister Mason's comments in June 2018 were inappropriate and is seen as inadequate consultation.	Consultation	At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that consultation with the Stoney Nakoda Nations had begun in October 2014, with multiple meetings and site visits occurring, as well as funding being provided for a TUS.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
30	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Administrative and financial challenges posed by the CEAA funding process, which are embedding additional project administration and financing to First Nations.	Funding	At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation informed Stoney Nakoda Nations that there was money available from their TUS budget, which will be paid once the TUS is received. Alberta Transportation requested a budget for any additional work Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to do. Alberta Transportation again requested a budget for the additional work (another site visit) in an email December 18, 2018 as well as in person on December 19, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, no budget has been received.	At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would not be submitting a TUS report or related budgets.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
31	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	EIA and the project cannot be looked at in isolation from other flood control measures	Project in relation to other flood measures	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Following the floods of June 2013, the government of Alberta assessed various flood mitigation measures as detailed in the Project Location Alternatives section of the Volume 1 Project Description of the EIA. The SR1 Project was selected as the preferred option. In addition, flood mitigation projects for Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows are underway.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations acknowledged this response but did not provide further feedback.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
32	December 9, 2016 Email Comment from Bill Snow, Consultation Manager, Stoney Tribal Government related to receiving notification that that an environmental assessment was being completed at McLean Creek as part of the SR1 project.	In response to the McLean Creek (MC1) option environmental assessment notification, Bill Snow requested that the project designers also include wildlife crossing options into their assessment.	Wildlife	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no intention to complete historical/indigenous impact studies for the MC1 option. An assessment of the MC1 option was included as part of the Project Location Alternatives assessment in the EIA (Volume 1, Section 3, Volume 4, Supporting Documentation). Alberta Transportation is applying for the SR1 Project. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, it was reiterated that the MC1 option was not moving forward.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the response in Table 7-4 responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
33	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Asked when/how historical/indigenous impact studies will be conducted for the McLean Creek option.	McLean Creek	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no intention to complete historical/indigenous impact studies for the MC1 option. An assessment of the MC1 option was included as part of the Project Location Alternatives assessment in the EIA (Volume 1, Section 3, Volume 4, Supporting Documentation). Alberta Transportation is applying for the SR1 Project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the Table 7-4 response on historical/indigenous impact studies responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.

Springbank SR1 - Specific Concerns and Response Table

First Nation or Metis Settlement: **Stoney Nakoda (Wesley) Nation**

Date: **AUGUST 2014 – FEBRUARY 2019**

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
1	<p>October 20, 2014 Initial Meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations occurred at the Super 8 Hotel in Cochrane AB.</p> <p>May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley.</p> <p>June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation</p>	<p>Stoney Nakoda Nation confirmed the SR1 project is in their traditional territory. They want to be able to complete an internal Cultural Review of the project area with Elders.</p> <p>Bill Snow indicated that Aboriginal Relations policy does not apply to private lands. He also indicated that the Stoney Nakoda Nations will want to undertake a Cultural Assessment of the Springbank Project Area.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda representatives indicated the need to do research in the river valleys, the Bow River was mentioned as one area that the Stoney Nakoda Nations need to do more testing.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation feel a Cultural Use Study, a Stoney Hydrology report, and a wildlife impacts study are required.</p>	<p>Cultural Resources Traditional Use Studies</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Stoney Nakoda Nations to conduct a Traditional Use Study (TUS) on the project lands (privately held). The Stoney Nakoda Nations conducted a TUS (11 field days) in the fall of 2016. The TUS report has not been received as of February 28, 2019. The TUS would have been used to inform the Traditional Land and Resource Use (TLRU) section of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) had it been received prior to submission.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations have not submitted a budget for a hydrology or wildlife study.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation has been engaged with Stoney Nakoda Nation since 2014 to understand how the Project potentially impacts rights, interests and traditional uses.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided funding for the Stoney Nakoda Bears paw, Chiniki, Wesley Nations to conduct a Traditional Use Study on the project lands. No report has been received to date, March 16, 2018.</p> <p>To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 11 site visits by Stoney Nakoda Nations within the Project Development Area (PDA) in the fall of 2016.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent the link to the October 2017 EIA to Stoney Nakoda Nation on November 3, 2017. On December 5, 2017, Alberta Transportation requested feedback on the TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further indigenous engagement activities.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation provided Stoney Nakoda Nations with the revised draft TLRU sections for review and comment under correspondence dated February 6, 2018. Alberta Transportation also offered a workshop with the goal of better understanding potential impacts of the Project to Stoney Nakoda Nations and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date.</p> <p>A workshop was held with Stoney Nakoda Nation on February 12, 2018, and was facilitated by Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA). Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU sections in the EIA have not been updated to include information discussed. A second workshop is planned for March 20, 2018.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations explained that they are currently being engaged on over 500 active projects and therefore capacity continues to be an issue for Stoney Nakoda Nations. They have done the site visits but have not written the report. The TUS is currently underway. Stoney Nakoda Nations is considering what additional work may be required.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they would submit what they would like to do and where they would like to visit.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would not be submitting a TUS report or related budgets.</p>	<p>Stoney Nakoda Nations will not be submitting further budgets and no reports or studies are expected.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to assist in arranging land access if Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to undertake another site visit. Alberta Transportation also indicated that Stoney Nakoda Nations could submit a budget for further work.			
2	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Indicated desire to do a site visit with elders.	Site visits	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation explained they do not have access to the SR1 lands, and access will have to be requested on an owner by owner basis. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: At the time of the request Alberta Transportation's agreement with the landowners for access had expired. Any additional access would need to be requested on an owner by owner basis. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to assist in arranging land access if Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to undertake another site visit. Alberta Transportation also indicated that Stoney Nakoda Nations could submit a budget for further work.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, the Stoney Nakoda Nations consultation team said they would speak with Elders to determine which areas to visit or revisit. Stoney Nakoda Nations said they would submit what they would like to do and where they would like to visit. At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would likely not be submitting a budget or a TUS report.		Ongoing: Working with First Nation
3	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	The Stoney Nakoda would like to mark the importance of the cultural assessment and place animal and plant studies into one cultural assessment as these topics relate to certain stories and wildlife behaviour. This relates to using cultural studies to look at animals and plant instead of relying only on scientific techniques.	Cultural assessment	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
4	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	The Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns to their Treaty Rights and traditional uses of lands in the Project area. Concerns were expressed for the Stoney Nakoda cultural practices, their current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, the effect on water and wetlands for wildlife, fish, birds and vegetation.	Treaty and Traditional Rights Wildlife Fish Vegetation Wetlands	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights are addressed through the assessment of the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. By acknowledging a link between practice-based rights and current use, this assessment accepts that adverse residual effects on availability of traditional resources for current use, on access to traditional resources or areas for current use, or on sites or areas for current use will have a consequent effect on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. Given that the residual effects for the Project on TLRU are predicted to be not significant, no effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights is expected to occur as a result of the Project. In addition, a conservative assumption was made that Indigenous groups had access to the PDA to practice traditional use activities notwithstanding access to these private lands is limited.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations did not completely agree with the response, explaining that the lands that are available for traditional land and resource use are getting smaller and smaller over the years. This is a cumulative effect and habitat replacement is important. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that an effect on wildlife results in an effect on Treaty rights.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
5	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley.	The Stoney Nakoda representatives spoke of doing a ceremony in the SR1 project area.	Ceremony	Alberta Transportation response in table set March 23, 2018: At the request of Indigenous groups, Alberta Transportation will participate in ceremonies (if invited) prior to the start of construction, including making offerings.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will confirm with CEAA regarding funding for holding a ceremony.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
6	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Dallas Maynard and Bill Snow at Starbucks, West Hills Shopping Centre	Bill Snow discussed the Stoney Nakoda Nations funding from CEAA and the desire for their Consultation team and elders to undertake a ceremony on the SR1 lands. Bill explained the Stoney had a long-standing relationship with Mary Robinson's family. They wanted Alberta Transportation and CEAA to participate.	Ceremony	Alberta Transportation agreed to a meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations on September 14, 2017, which included CEAA, to discuss and work with the Stoney Nakoda Nation to respond to their requests. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: At the request of Indigenous groups, Alberta Transportation will participate in ceremonies (if invited) prior to the start of construction, including making offerings. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated that if Stoney Nakoda Nations required funding for a ceremony to submit a budget to Alberta Transportation.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will confirm with CEAA regarding funding for holding a ceremony. Stoney Nakoda Nations will reach out to a landowner to access their land in order to view some sites; Stoney Nakoda Nations' preference is to perform a ceremony pre-construction on or near their land as well, as there are tipi rings and sites present on the property.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
7	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley. January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Stated there are two different trap lines out there and their members use the area for trapping but did not specify their location. EIA reflects existence of at least two Stoney Nakoda traplines in project area, loss of harvesting opportunities will have to be compensated	Hunting	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Based on available information there are no registered traplines within the PDA. Alberta Transportation has requested the locations of the two traplines and were the Stoney members trap in order to determine if there is potential impact from the Project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations confirmed that the traplines are located west of Bragg Creek and there are no active traplines in the Project area.	No further mitigation required as the traplines are not in the project area and will not be affected.	No further action required.
8	May 4, 2016 Meeting with Stoney Nakoda Nations at the Chiniki Restaurant Meeting Room on HWY #1 at Morley. February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Asked if the SR1 project would include any wildlife crossings, and also inquired about fencing. Emphasized the importance of wildlife crossings and was concerned that if not properly managed could be a problem for the SR1 project.	Wildlife	At the meeting held on May 4, 2016, Alberta Transportation responded that the SR1 diversion channels and the earthen dam would be designed to allow the passage of wildlife along the Elbow River. Alberta Transportation responded that there will likely be some fencing on the SR1 Project. Alberta Transportation response in table set March 23, 2018: Although the Project would result in additional anthropogenic features on the landscape that might hinder wildlife movement in the local assessment area, Alberta Transportation has made adjustments to accommodate wildlife movement such as revegetating the floodplain berm with materials conducive for ungulate movement. The EIA concluded that the project residual effects on wildlife movement are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species, including species at risk (EIA, Volume 3A and 3B section 11). At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.	Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns that wildlife will not adapt to the new land configurations. Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques. At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>		
9	<p>September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.</p> <p>February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.</p>	<p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns over wildlife passage through the SR1 area following construction. Inquired if there would be wildlife crossings built over HWY 22 or Highway 8.</p> <p>There is a concern with the lack of wildlife corridors and that the project will impact wildlife movement. Wildlife need space and the option to travel the corridors. This goes back to Elder memories because how the animals use the land today is similar to how they used the land in the past.</p>	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that there was no plan to build wildlife overpasses. Alberta Transportation indicated that the diversion channel and dam were contoured to allow for wildlife passage through the SR1 area during non-flood times.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no plan to build wildlife overpasses. The diversion channel and dam were contoured to allow for wildlife passage through the SR1 area during non-flood times. The channel will be directed under HWY 22 and Township Road 242. The area underneath the bridges will contain rip rap however, the rip rap under the bridges will be filled with gravel potentially enabling animals to move under the bridges and avoid crossing the roads.</p> <p>With respect to Project design, the side slopes and bottom of the diversion channel will be vegetated, with the following exceptions. Where the diversion channel passes through bedrock, the channel would remain as an exposed bedrock cut. Articulated concrete matting will be provided in select areas of the channel where pipelines cross. Riprap erosion protection will be provided at critical areas including at bridge crossings, around the emergency spillway and for a 1.4 km stretch at the diversion channel outlet structure. The south portion, farthest from Elbow River, will be a 450-m earthen embankment vegetated with native grasses. The floodplain berm will also be covered with materials conducive to ungulate movement (see Volume 3A, Section 11).</p> <p>A remote camera program will be designed in consultation with Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP), to identify whether the diversion channel acts as a barrier to wildlife movement during dry operations, especially for ungulates, and determine the effectiveness of mitigation implemented throughout the diversion channel. The remote camera program will also include monitoring along the Elbow River to determine if wildlife use of the Key Wildlife and Biodiversity Zone (KWBZ) has been affected by the construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed ongoing concerns with infrastructure affecting wildlife passage and recommend the consideration of wildlife crossings, including overpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations continued to express concerns related to wildlife movement through the project area.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>			
10	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns that the fences that would be built around the SR1 site might impact wildlife passage through the area.	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation explained the fences that were planned for the SR1 project would be similar to the farm fencing that already exists and should not have any additional impact to wildlife than currently exists.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Fences that are planned for the SR1 project would be similar to the farm fencing that already exists and should not have any additional impact to wildlife than currently exists.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that this type of fencing should be okay for wildlife.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. Alberta Transportation will be using wildlife friendly fencing around the SR1 boundary that will allow wildlife to move under and over.	No further action required.
11	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	Concern that there is a lack of long-term wildlife studies on the cumulative impacts the SR1 project would have to wildlife. These studies should address animal movement in the area.	Wildlife	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist, who explained there is a monitoring program planned with wildlife cameras to monitor long-term cumulative effects of the project on wildlife.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations continued to express concerns related to wildlife movement through the project area, and said wildlife cameras do not catch everything.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
12	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	Concerns that the SR1 project will act as a barrier to the migration of wildlife and fish. Concerns over the lack of wildlife crossings on the SR1 project.	Wildlife Fish	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Stoney Nakoda Nation (wildlife and fish) will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Although the Project would result in additional anthropogenic features on the landscape that might hinder wildlife movement in the local assessment area, Alberta Transportation has made adjustments to accommodate wildlife movement such as revegetating the floodplain berm with materials conducive for ungulate movement. The EIA concluded that the project residual effects on</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concern about fish returning to the habitat once the coffer dam (used during construction) has been removed.</p> <p>The Stoney Nakoda Nations consultation team will discuss fish species of importance (including mountain whitefish, cutthroat, and bull trout) during the next</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>wildlife movement are unlikely to pose a long-term threat to the persistence or viability of a wildlife species, including species at risk (EIA, Volume 3A and 3B section 11).</p> <p>During Project design it was recognized that the diversion structure could result in an increase in flow rates of the Elbow River at the structure and potentially affect the ability of fish to pass upstream. In order to avoid affecting fish passage design elements were incorporated to ensure that under normal river conditions flow rates are maintained within the range suitable for fish passage.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec explained that fish can pass through the diversion structure during dry conditions and flood conditions. Stantec showed an engineering diagram of the reservoir and how it would affect fish. They also showed berms that will be installed to control the water speed and allow fish to move upstream.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec brought their wildlife biologist to answer questions. The wildlife biologist explained that they were revegetating the structure to make it easier for animals to walk across. Alberta Transportation also explained that the fencing would have smooth top and bottom wires to allow for wildlife going under and over the fence.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the underpasses that will be created by the diversion channel crossings of HWY 22 and Township Road 242 have not been designed as designated wildlife underpasses; but, the design has included measures to accommodate the passage of wildlife that would otherwise cross over HWY 22. The HWY 22 underpass will have 3:1 slopes and be 24 m wide at the bottom. Gaps in the riprap armour on the bottom of the channel will be filled and surfaced with gravel.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Stantec's wildlife biologist to present the mitigation measures in place for wildlife, including fencing, vegetating slopes, and a remote camera monitoring program that Stoney Nakoda Nation can provide input on. They also showed a drawing of the bridge under HWY 22 and how it will be modified to promote wildlife movement.</p>	<p>Elder's meeting to understand potential effects and mitigation better.</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations and Alberta Transportation discussed habitat replacement and confirmed that it will be replaced and this will be directed by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO).</p> <p>Stoney Nakoda Nations requested that a discussion be held with Alberta Transportation regarding alternative options for fish salvage, beyond electrofishing.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018 and in an email on September 14, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations further expressed concerns that there are no dedicated wildlife crossings for the SR1 project. Stoney Nakoda Nations would prefer overpasses for wildlife rather than underpasses.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation indicated that Alberta Transportation's mitigation measures for wildlife alleviated some of Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns, but they would still prefer overpasses.</p>		
13	June 8, 2016 Letter from Bill Snow to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Alberta Transportation	Concerns expressed that the proposed SR1 project will drive away or minimize the availability of birds, fish, and wildlife.	Wildlife Fish	Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Stoney Nakoda Nation (wildlife and fish) will be addressed as part of the EIA. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in direct and indirect loss of wildlife habitat during construction and dry operations; however, the amount of wildlife habitat permanently affected (168 ha) is relatively small compared to the availability of wildlife habitat remaining in the local assessment area (4,860 ha). Although there would be temporary displacement and disturbance to wildlife during construction, a measurable change in the abundance of wildlife in the regional assessment area is unlikely.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations recommended that long-term/cumulative wildlife studies be conducted in the Project area. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that it is important to do cultural studies on wildlife, fish, etc. rather than relying only on Western scientific techniques.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
14	June 4, 2018	Concerned that the rate of stabilization for fish will take	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec explained there would be a disruption and habitat loss in that area. Alberta Transportation will engineer	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	longer than the expected three years and it will take a long time for them to acclimate to the conditions post-construction.		rocks/berms to give the fish areas of shelter. Stantec explained they would design the structure to ensure the fish have proper water speed and depth to move up-river.			
15	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	Native fish species (mountain white fish, bull trout and cutthroat trout) should be included in the discussion on fish and fish habitat. These are species that First Nations traditionally subsided on and lands in SR1 were used as camping spots to access these fish resources. In addition, the Stony Nakoda are noticing a decrease in water levels which will have a further impact on fish habitat.	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec went over the fish species they found in the Elbow River and the proportion of each in different sections of the river.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations said they will discuss the topic at their next Elders meeting.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
16	June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.	There is a concern using electrofishing and that fish will die during relocation. Stoney Nakoda Nations would like Alberta Transportation to explore other ways of retrieving and relocating the stranded fish.	Fish	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation said they will look at methods of capturing fish and note the concern with electrofishing.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
17	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency September 13, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations and Alberta Transportation	The Stoney Nakoda Nation was concerned about the hydrology of the SR1 area. In particular cited the Elbow River vs. groundwater impacts.	Hydrology	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA considered the effects of the Project on both surface water (Volume 3A and 3B, section 6) and groundwater, including the Alluvial Aquifer (Volumes 3A and 3B, section 5, Appendix 1). The assessment used a complex numerical groundwater model (FEFLOW) to evaluate potential changes to the hydrogeologic system, including aquifer pressure, caused by floods and construction and operation of the Project. The results of a series of the modeling scenarios showed that the groundwater levels and flow patterns are altered within the vicinity of the proposed Project. Changes are observed within the reservoir area during flooding and recede toward pre-flood conditions following floods. Changes in the groundwater flow regime are also observed along the proposed diversion channel. The model results were used as the basis for the EIA. The assessment concluded that effects to groundwater quantity and quality would not be significant. The residual effects on groundwater quantity from the Project are assessed as not significant because they would not decrease the yield of groundwater supply wells to the point where they can no longer be used. The residual	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated this concern was raised by the consultation officer for Chiniki First Nation. Stoney Nakoda Nations will provide the hydrology summary (from the EIA Summary) to Chiniki First Nation to confirm whether this response addresses the concern.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>effects on groundwater quality from the Project are assessed as not significant because changes in groundwater quality at existing wells would not deteriorate to the point where it becomes non-potable or cannot meet the Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality for a consecutive period exceeding 30 days (for those parameters which don't already, under existing conditions, exceed those guidelines). Effects to groundwater would be limited to the local assessment area.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stantec showed figures to help explain the hydrology of the SR1 project area. Alberta Transportation also explained that the natural clay till cap would act as a natural barrier and not allow flood water to mix with groundwater.</p> <p>At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation responded that hydrology information had been shared in Sections 3A and 3B of the EIA. Alberta Transportation committed to providing the EIA material again.</p> <p>In an email on October 24, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided a link to a FTP site with the March 2018 EIA.</p>			
18	<p>September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency June 4, 2018 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4. February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	<p>The Stoney Nakoda Nation was concerned that Crown land should be set aside to replace lands taken for SR1.</p> <p>There is a concern from the Stoney Nakoda Nation that the land they can practise Aboriginal Treaty Rights on is getting smaller with an increase in development. This has an impact on Aboriginal Rights.</p> <p>There is a concern that the SR1 area was used in the past for traditional activities, such as hunting, and camping and that this activity would be permanently altered by the Project.</p>	Land replacement	<p>At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that any wetlands impacted would be replaced however the overall SR1 lands would not be replaced.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: If approved, the project requires the acquisition of private land. Landowners would be provided monetary compensation. These private lands will not be replaced.</p> <p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained there will be more land access through the eastern area of the project area and this is a grazing lease.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation presented on the proposed land use plan in which Stoney Nakoda Nations could participate.</p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations requested a discussion regarding compensation for the loss of access to Crown lands, since the Project area will become Crown land once it is purchased from private land owners.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
19	February 22, 2019 Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Stoney Nakoda Nation is interested in participating in monitoring programs.	Monitoring	At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation committed to continued discussions on monitoring.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation
20	October 20, 2014 Initial Meeting with the Stoney Nakoda Nations occurred at	Inquired about the oil pipelines that cross the SR1 lands and what would happen to them as part of SR1.	Pipelines	<p>At the meeting held on October 20, 2014, Alberta Transportation responded the oil pipelines would likely be relocated, but at the time that information was not available.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific</i></p>	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations expressed concerns about emergency preparedness. Stoney Nakoda Nations requests reassurance that there will be	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>the Super 8 Hotel in Cochrane AB.</p> <p>February 22, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>			<p><i>Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The procedures for dealing with overhead and buried utilities located within constructions zones is highly regulated. All regulatory requirements will be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>Oil and gas pipelines operated by four companies (TransCanada Pipelines Ltd., Pengrowth Energy Corp., Veresen Inc., and Plains Midstream Canada) are located within the diversion channel, dam, and reservoir areas.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation are currently in contact with these utility owners and crossing agreements will be developed. Buried pipeline and overhead utilities will be relocated, moved or lowered as required. Prior to any soil disturbance, utility locate sweeps will be done and buried lines and pipelines will be flagged and marked. Pipeline crossings will be designed and maintained as required by the utility owners and in strict compliance with regulations. Daily hazard assessments will be conducted before work is undertaken in the vicinity of utilities. In the event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address pipeline emergency response. The implementation preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>In the unlikely event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address and coordinate the emergency response. The implementation of preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation showed a map with the current pipelines within the project area, what is in them, who owns them, and what would happen to them if the Project is approved. It was confirmed there was no sour gas in any of the lines. Alberta Transportation committed to looking into mercaptans.</p>	<p>an emergency response plan in place and that the regulator(s) will manage the response in the event of an incident, spill, release, etc. Stoney Nakoda Nations stated that a communication plan needs to be part of the response plan.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation voiced concerns regarding any mercaptans that may have been added to the contents of the pipelines around the SR1 Project.</p>		
21	<p>June 4, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Stoney Nakoda Nation's concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses as in Table 7-4.</p> <p>February 22, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	<p>There is a concern with emergency response preparedness and how emergencies would be communicated to the Stoney Nakoda Nations (specifically for pipelines and utility lines).</p>	<p>Pipelines and utility lines</p> <p>Emergency response</p>	<p>At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Alberta Transportation said they will get information on what pipelines and utility lines are in the area and who owns the lines. Alberta Transportation will review whether the regulator is AUC or the AER and investigate the emergency response plans of the utility companies.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Alberta Transportation indicated the emergency response plans for pipelines were the responsibility of the pipeline owners.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns about general emergency response planning, including with regards to pipelines.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with the First Nation</p>
22	<p>January 15, 2017</p> <p>Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations</p>	<p>Questions about location of Calgary/Morleyville Trail, and if Alberta considers it a pre-existing trail prior to 1877 then an allowance for a right-of-way through the Proposed</p>	<p>Historic Trails</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
		Development Area will have to be provided for.					
23	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	The Stoney Nakoda Nation expressed concerns with the Stoney lack of mapping capability and requested some assistance understanding the SR1 mapping.	Mapping	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation agreed to provide a PDF and Google KMZ map of the test bore holes that Stantec completed during the site investigation phase at the SR1 project. Maps of the test bore hole locations were sent to Stoney Nakoda Nations September 17, 2017. In an email on October 6, 2017, Alberta Transportation recommended a company capable of doing GIS (geographic information system) mapping, and offered to look into what GIS data Stantec had that could be shared. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation provided a PDF and Google KMZ map of the test Bore holes completed during the site investigation phase at the SR1 project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations confirmed they had received the test bore hole location maps sent by Alberta Transportation.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. The maps were provided to Stoney Nakoda Nations.	No further action required.
24	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Transportation has used incorrect maps of Stoney IR 142, 143, 144.	Mapping of Stoney IR 142, 143, 144.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA has been updated to use the correct maps of the Stoney Nakoda Nation Reserves 142, 143, 144. The map was sourced from the Natural Resources Canada, Lands and Minerals Sector – Geobase http://ftp.geogratis.gc.ca/pub/nrcan_rncan/vector/geobase_al_ta/	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the updated maps of IR 142, 143, and 144, included in the March 2018 EIA responded to the concern. The maps were included in the updated EIA.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation. The maps of IR 142, 143, and 144 were corrected in the March 2018 EIA.	No further action required.
25	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Provide map of location of traditional territory of Stoney Nakoda	Traditional territory	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA provides a description of the Stoney Nakoda traditional territory from source - SIB 2014: Amended Statement of Claim, Court File Number 0301-19586. This amended statement of claim was prepared and filed by Stoney Nakoda Nations in the context of Action Number 0301-19586. This source was used to provide background information for Stoney Nakoda Nations, including information on the traditional territory. The scope of the identified traditional territory is one of the issues in dispute in the context of this litigation.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that this responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.
26	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Dallas Maynard and Bill Snow at Starbucks, West Hills Shopping Centre	Bill Snow explained there have recently been elections within the Stoney Nakoda Nations and he would like to request that Alberta Transportation organize a presentation on the SR1 to update their Chiefs and CAOs on SR1.	Information sharing	Alberta Transportation followed up November 10, 2017 asking if Stoney Nakoda Nation were still interested in having a presentation for the newly elected officials and received no response. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation presented the SR1 Project to the Stoney Nakoda Nation at the Stoney Nakoda Resort on February 12, 2018. A further workshop at the Stoney Nakoda Resort has been scheduled for February 20, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, no further requests have been made by Stoney Nakoda Nation to present to Chief and Council.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
27	September 14, 2017 Meeting at Stoney Nakoda Resort between the Stoney Nakoda Nations, Alberta Transportation and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Requested an on-reserve presentation on the SR1 project.	Information sharing	At the meeting held on September 14, 2017, Alberta Transportation said they would inquire about accommodating an on-reserve presentation. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation presented the SR1 Project to the Stoney Nakoda Nation at the Stoney Nakoda Resort on February 12, 2018. A further workshop at the Stoney Nakoda Resort has been scheduled for February 20, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, Alberta Transportation has met with Stoney Nakoda Nations a total of 11 times.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations responded that they will discuss whether this concern has been met with other members of the consultation team.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
28	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Alberta Transporting does not have a good record in accommodating First Nation project concerns or sharing information.	Consultation	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
29	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Minister Mason's comments in June 2018 were inappropriate and is seen as inadequate consultation.	Consultation	At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that consultation with the Stoney Nakoda Nations had begun in October 2014, with multiple meetings and site visits occurring, as well as funding being provided for a TUS.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
30	September 14, 2018 Email from Bill Snow to Dallas Maynard.	Administrative and financial challenges posed by the CEAA funding process, which are embedding additional project administration and financing to First Nations.	Funding	At the meeting held on September 13, 2018, Alberta Transportation informed Stoney Nakoda Nations that there was money available from their TUS budget, which will be paid once the TUS is received. Alberta Transportation requested a budget for any additional work Stoney Nakoda Nations would like to do. Alberta Transportation again requested a budget for the additional work (another site visit) in an email December 18, 2018 as well as in person on December 19, 2018. As of February 28, 2019, no budget has been received.	At the meeting held on February 22, 2019, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated they would not be submitting a TUS report or related budgets.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with the First Nation.
31	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	EIA and the project cannot be looked at in isolation from other flood control measures	Project in relation to other flood measures	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Following the floods of June 2013, the government of Alberta assessed various flood mitigation measures as detailed in the Project Location Alternatives section of the Volume 1 Project Description of the EIA. The SR1 Project was selected as the preferred option. In addition, flood mitigation projects for Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows are underway.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations acknowledged this response but did not provide further feedback.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
32	December 9, 2016 Email Comment from Bill Snow, Consultation Manager, Stoney Tribal Government related to receiving notification that that an environmental assessment was being completed at McLean Creek as part of the SR1 project.	In response to the McLean Creek (MC1) option environmental assessment notification, Bill Snow requested that the project designers also include wildlife crossing options into their assessment.	Wildlife	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no intention to complete historical/indigenous impact studies for the MC1 option. An assessment of the MC1 option was included as part of the Project Location Alternatives assessment in the EIA (Volume 1, Section 3, Volume 4, Supporting Documentation). Alberta Transportation is applying for the SR1 Project. At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, it was reiterated that the MC1 option was not moving forward.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the response in Table 7-4 responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Specific Concern Expressed	3. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
33	January 15, 2017 Letter sent via email to Shelly Boss, CEAA from Rae and Company on behalf of the Stoney Nakoda Nations	Asked when/how historical/indigenous impact studies will be conducted for the McLean Creek option.	McLean Creek	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-4 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Stoney Nakoda Nations</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is no intention to complete historical/indigenous impact studies for the MC1 option. An assessment of the MC1 option was included as part of the Project Location Alternatives assessment in the EIA (Volume 1, Section 3, Volume 4, Supporting Documentation). Alberta Transportation is applying for the SR1 Project.	At the meeting held on June 4, 2018, Stoney Nakoda Nations indicated that the Table 7-4 response on historical/indigenous impact studies responded to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.

Springbank SR1 - Specific Concerns and Response Table

First Nation or Metis Settlement: **Tsuut'ina Nation**

Date: **AUGUST 2014 – FEBRUARY 2019**

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
1	<p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc. September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation</p>	<p>Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Hunting Fishing Wildlife Fish Birds</p>	<p>Our (Tsuut'ina) citizens are currently able to exercise their Treaty Rights on private lands surrounding our Reserve. Further impacts to wildlife, fish and birds, as well as exercise of Tsuut'ina Aboriginal, Treaty and inherent rights. Concerns about the impacts to hunting and fishing, including barriers to access, habitat loss, changes in wildlife/fish behaviour, health, abundance/availability, locations, change in health and flow of water, etc. Concerns about Tsuut'ina's ability to pursue traditional land use practices and foreseeable impacts on Tsuut'ina Nation reserve lands and water. Identified lack of access is the principle barrier to using their traditional lands, followed by environmental concerns regarding food. Concerned that compounding impacts from the Project and ongoing development will compromise harvesters' ability to fish in certain areas of the Elbow River and its tributaries, and will also force harvesters to travel further away to hunt. Concern that changes to health and flow of Elbow River will affect their ability to harvest trout and whitefish. Concerned that bull trout, which are classified as Threatened under Alberta's Wildlife Act, will be affected by the Project.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA): The EIA has considered potential effects to wildlife, fish and birds, as well as the exercise of rights and traditional uses. The Project will result in direct and indirect loss of wildlife habitat during construction and dry operations; however, the amount of wildlife habitat permanently affected (168 ha) is relatively small compared to the availability of wildlife habitat remaining in the local assessment area (LAA) (4,860 ha). Although there would be temporary displacement and disturbance to wildlife during construction, a measurable change in the abundance of wildlife in the regional assessment area is unlikely. The Project would result in temporarily unavailable wildlife habitat during flood operations and post-flood operations, with some potential permanent loss of wetlands due to sedimentation, which will result in its conversion into upland communities. Vegetation lost during floods would eventually be replaced by self-propagation of native vegetation in the surrounding area, or reestablished through hydroseeding. The amount of wildlife habitat affected is relatively small compared to the availability of wildlife habitat remaining in the regional assessment area (102,817 ha). The Project would result in direct and indirect alteration of fish habitat during construction and dry operations; however, the amount of fish habitat permanently affected (1,854 m²) is relatively small compared to the availability of fish habitat remaining in the local assessment area (3,100,000 m²). For the purposes of the EIA, effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights are addressed through the assessment of the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. By acknowledging a link between practice-based rights and current use, the assessment accepts that adverse residual effects on the availability of traditional resources for current use, on access to traditional resources or areas for current use, or on sites or areas for current use will have a consequent effect on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. In addition, a conservative assumption was made that Indigenous groups had access to the PDA to practice traditional use activities notwithstanding access to these private lands is limited. At the meeting held on September 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated they will complete pre-construction nest sweeps and buffer bird nests based on recommendations from Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP).</p>	<p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation expressed their desire to have a meeting to specifically discuss impacts to Treaty rights.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>Concerned that the Project will disturb spawning areas in the Elbow River and tributaries.</p> <p>The ability for Tsuut'ina Nation to continue to access healthy water and fish within their traditional territory is a significant concern.</p> <p>Concerned about the ability to exercise spiritual rights, such as hunting, fishing, and harvesting plants.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, and wildlife and wildlife habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for hunting, fishing, and traditional use, including: development of a land use plan; and mitigation measures for wildlife and fish. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 6, 2018, Alberta Transportation presented on their proposed plan for a land use plan that would include: access for traditional use, hunting, and harvesting; management during/after a flood; and ongoing monitoring programs.</p>			
2	December 6, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.	Methodology Treaty rights	Concerns about the methodology used in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and TUS Response regarding Treaty rights.	Under cover dated January 28, 2019, Alberta Transportation requested that Tsuut'ina Nation provide its views and perspectives on its Aboriginal and Treaty rights, cultural and experiential values, and country foods. The letter listed four specific topics that Alberta Transportation was requesting input on to help answer Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) IR2-01, IR2-02, and IR2-08. The specific information requests were attached as Appendix A. A deadline of February 28, 2019 was given for written feedback to be included in the IR responses. Feedback received after the deadline will be incorporated into regulatory submissions and project planning, as appropriate.	<p>In a letter dated February 28, 2019, Tsuut'ina Nation responded to Alberta Transportation's January 28, 2019. Alberta Transportation received the CEAA IRs over five months prior to the date of the January 28, 2019 letter, but only provided Tsuut'ina Nation with four weeks to respond. Please explain the timing behind Alberta Transportation's request.</p> <p>The timing of Alberta Transportation's request is problematic given that the environmental assessment for the Project is not yet complete. Tsuut'ina has identified a number of information gaps in the environmental assessment, including with respect to issues relating to groundwater, surface water, vegetation and wetlands, wildlife, archaeological sites, and cumulative effects. This information is needed to understand how the Project will impact Tsuut'ina's Aboriginal and treaty rights and what mitigation or accommodation measures will be required to mitigate potential impacts.</p> <p>In Tsuut'ina Nation's view, it is not a robust or respectful approach to the assessment of potential impacts to Tsuut'ina's Aboriginal and Treaty rights from the Project to expect that impacts can be identified and mitigated in the absence of the information that Tsuut'ina has identified as necessary and is still being collected.</p> <p>Should Alberta Transportation intend to submit its responses to the IRs without waiting for the outstanding information to be collected and assessed, Tsuut'ina requests the opportunity to</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
					review the draft IR responses before they are submitted to CEAA so that they can provide their input.		
3	November 13, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services	Impact to Reserve Traditional Territory	Tsuut'ina Nation had concerns about the Elbow River and how the SR1 project would impact their Territory and Reserves.	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Tsuut'ina Nation will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Tsuut'ina Nation to conduct two Traditional Use Studies (TUS) and funded a Ceremony and Feast on the project lands (privately and publicly held). Alberta Transportation received the TUS, with permission to use, on April 3, 2018.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Tsuut'ina reserve lands have been included in the EIA.</p> <p>The potential effects of the Project have been assessed using three geographic areas. The Project Development Area (PDA), the Local Assessment Area (LAA) and the Regional Assessment Area (RAA).</p> <p>The PDA represents the project footprint i.e., immediate area of physical disturbance and construction activities (approximately 1440 ha). The PDA located on private land, north of the Elbow River, and this area is the same for all the valued components (VCs). The LAA is an area larger than the PDA and is considered to be the area where Project effects would be reasonably expected to occur and where effects can be predicted or measured with a reasonable degree of accuracy. The RAA is an area larger than the LAA and is an area within which Project effects may interact or accumulate with the effects of other projects or activities. The size of the LAA and RAA varies depending on the VC being assessed. In many cases the assessment areas include the Tsuut'ina Reserve.</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of VCs the EIA document also contains an assessment of the potential Project effects on Federal Lands, including the Tsuut'ina Reserve (Volume 3A and 3B, Chapter 18).</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to revising the hydrogeological model to include the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve.</p> <p>In a letter dated July 20, 2018, Alberta Transportation advised Tsuut'ina Nation that, based on the comments by PGL Environmental, they are revisiting the hydrogeological modelling. The southern boundary is being extended to account for Tsuut'ina Nation's concerns regarding potential impact to groundwater on and near the reserve.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 8, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided an explanation of the additional work being done on the hydrogeological model. The study area has been expanded to include the Tsuut'ina reserve and well records from the reserve are being</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation stated that the project is potentially adversely affecting the Nation socioeconomically, affecting their ability to harvest medicinal plants, wildlife, and affecting ceremony held at the powwow grounds.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation questioned the boundaries of the various study areas in the EIA, and recommended the boundaries be enlarged to include the Tsuut'ina reserve.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation requested that the boundaries for the hydrogeological model include the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation expressed their desire to have a meeting to specifically discuss impacts to Treaty rights.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				incorporated. A new baseline is being created and then the hydrogeological model will be re-run.			
4	<p>May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p>	Location	Concerns regarding the selection of the SR1 site within 395 metres of the Tsuut'ina Reserve.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The closest point of the project to the Tsuut'ina Reserve is 930 m. This is the distance from the reserve to the edge of back water on the river in the event of a flood of the 2013 flood magnitude. The closest point of a physical SR1 component to the Tsuut'ina Reserve is 1130 m, the distance from the Tsuut'ina Reserve to the flood plain berm, Volume 3A, Section 18, Figure 18-3.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided the following clarification in relation to the map provided to Tsuut'ina Nation indicating potential water "back up" behind the diversion structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The blue line on the map indicates the anticipated surface water back up of flood water behind the diversion structure in a flood event when the gates are in operation and working correctly. This water back up reaches a point approximately 1680 m from the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve if measured following the active river channel or 1130 m if measured directly south over land. 2. The closest extent of the physical infrastructure to the Tsuut'ina reserve boundary is 1130 m. 3. The red dash line on the figure represents the Project Development Area. This line is a conservation buffer. It represents the maximum extent of potential surface water "back up" in the event the diversion structure malfunctions. Should the service spillway gates close but the diversion gates fail to open water would "back up" behind the service spillway and floodplain berm. The red line indicates the maximum extent to which water would back up before it reached the height of the flood plain berm. At this point the flood water would overtop the flood plain berm. The distance of 930 m indicated on the map was measured within the active channel. <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation showed videos and images of the 1:16 model of the SR1 Project design to demonstrate the engineering of the Project and how water and debris would flow. A USB flash drive with these videos and images was sent to Tsuut'ina Nation under cover dated August 28, 2018.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested confirmation that 930 m is the closest extent of the Project to the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation requested the opportunity to see the conceptual Project model.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
5	<p>May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p>	Traditional Territory	Concerns regarding the entire project lying within Tsuut'ina's traditional territory.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Tsuut'ina reserve lands have been included in the EIA.</p> <p>The potential effects of the Project have been assessed using three geographic areas. The Project Development Area (PDA), the Local Assessment Area (LAA) and the Regional Assessment Area (RAA).</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation asked about there not being a traditional territory map in the EIA.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks			<p>The PDA represents the project footprint i.e., immediate area of physical disturbance and construction activities (approximately 1440 ha). The PDA located on private land, north of the Elbow River, and this area is the same for all the valued components (VCs). The LAA is an area larger than the PDA and is considered to be the area where Project effects would be reasonably expected to occur and where effects can be predicted or measured with a reasonable degree of accuracy. The RAA is an area larger than the LAA and is an area within which Project effects may interact or accumulate with the effects of other projects or activities. The size of the LAA and RAA varies depending on the VC being assessed. In many cases the assessment areas include the Tsuut'ina Reserve.</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of VCs the EIA document also contains an assessment of the potential Project effects on Federal Lands, including the Tsuut'ina Reserve (Volume 3A and 3B, Chapter 18).</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation responded that CEAA requires maps of traditional territory, but out of respect, a map had not been included in the EIA because they wanted to use one approved by Tsuut'ina Nation.</p>			
6	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Federal lands	Reassess effects to federal lands to include entirety of Tsuut'ina IR 145.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
7	April 21, 2016 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services	Buffer zone	Tsuut'ina Consultation Office have concerns and made SR1 map inquiries related to the buffer zones around the SR1 Project, in particular impacts to their Reserve Lands.	<p>At the meeting held on April 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation informed Tsuut'ina Nation that the areas not shown as buffer lands were areas where no access was available to the private lands.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The potential effects of the Project have been assessed using three geographic areas. The Project Development Area (PDA), the Local Assessment Area (LAA) and the Regional Assessment Area (RAA).</p> <p>The LAA is generally an area larger than the PDA and is considered to be the area where Project effects would be reasonably expected to occur and where effects can be predicted or measured with a reasonable degree of accuracy.</p> <p>The RAA is an area larger than the LAA and is an area within which Project effects may interact or accumulate with the effects of other projects or activities.</p> <p>The LAA and RAAs are generally significantly larger than the PDA to ensure that Project effects are assessed beyond the project footprint. For example, in Aquatic Ecology, the PDA is 1440 ha, the LAA is</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation questioned the boundaries of the study area for the hydrogeologic model in the EIA, and recommended the boundaries of the study area be enlarged to include the Tsuut'ina reserve. Especially noted concerns regarding the assessment not including water wells on the reserve.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested further work to drill new wells on Tsuut'ina land believing it will result in the hydrogeologic model more accurately showing conditions on Tsuut'ina land.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>10,364 ha and represents an area from the Elbow Falls to the inlet of the Glenmore Reservoir, and the RAA is 125,438 ha and represents the Elbow River Watershed. In this case both the LAA and RAA intersect with the Tsuut'ina Reserve.</p> <p>The EIA document also contains an assessment of the potential Project effects on Federal Lands (Volume 3A and 3B, Chapter 18).</p> <p>At the meetings held On May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to revising the hydrogeological model to include the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve.</p> <p>In a letter dated July 20, 2018, Alberta Transportation advised Tsuut'ina Nation that, based on the comments by PGL Environmental, they are revisiting the hydrogeological modelling. The southern boundary is being extended to account for Tsuut'ina Nation's concerns regarding potential impact to groundwater on and near the reserve.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 8, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided an explanation of the additional work being done on the hydrogeological model. The study area has been expanded to include the Tsuut'ina reserve and well records from the reserve are being incorporated. A new baseline is being created and then the hydrogeological model will be re-run.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided an update on the work being done on the hydrogeologic model. An additional 1850 wells from the Tsuut'ina reserve have been added. The additional work has confirmed the Elbow River as a hydrogeologic divide.</p>			
8	<p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p> <p>February 28, 2019 Letter from Tanis Onespot to Alberta Transportation</p>	Traditional use	<p>Concerned about how our other uses of the Elbow River will be affected, including for transportation and as the community's water source.</p> <p>Would like the river to be looked at as navigable waterway.</p> <p>The Elbow River is an important source of drinking water as it is connected to the groundwater on their reserve.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project's effects on river transportation consists of the need to portage around the diversion structure. Alberta Environment and Parks, the final operator of the Project, will avoid the substantial interference with navigation of the Elbow River through design and best management practices. As part of construction, a permanent portage will be developed around the in-stream water intake components. Signs directing traffic to detours will be installed during construction of road realignments and modifications. Signs will be installed along the existing Elbow River channel and on the dam. Multiple signs will be placed upstream and downstream of the water intake components on both banks of the Elbow River. These signs would warn users on the Elbow River that they are approaching in-stream water intake components and of the associated danger with this infrastructure and to direct them to a portage location. A floating, high visibility boom will be in place upstream and downstream of the water intake component.</p> <p>Through the Indigenous engagement program, Tsuut'ina Nation identified Elbow River as a source of drinking water and noted the importance of the river's connection to groundwater. Tsuut'ina Nation also indicated that they depend on the groundwater in the Elbow River</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation questioned the boundaries of the study area for the hydrogeologic model in the EIA, and recommended the boundaries of the study area be enlarged to include the Tsuut'ina reserve. Especially noted concerns regarding the assessment not including water wells on the reserve.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>Alluvial Aquifer for the reserves' domestic drinking water. The Tsuut'ina noted that there are over 1500 wells on the reserve. The EIA concluded that with the application of standard construction mitigation measures potential effects of the Project on surface water quality and groundwater quality and quantity are not significant. In respect of these conclusions, it is anticipated that there will be no effects on the sources of drinking water identified by Tsuut'ina Nation, or the ability of other Indigenous groups to use Elbow River as a source of drinking water.</p> <p>At the meetings held On May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to revising the hydrogeological model to include the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve.</p> <p>In a letter dated July 20, 2018, Alberta Transportation advised Tsuut'ina Nation that, based on the comments by PGL Environmental, they are revisiting the hydrogeological modelling. The southern boundary is being extended to account for Tsuut'ina Nation's concerns regarding potential impact to groundwater on and near the reserve.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 8, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided an explanation of the additional work being done on the hydrogeological model. The study area has been expanded to include the Tsuut'ina reserve and well records from the reserve are being incorporated. A new baseline is being created and then the hydrogeological model will be re-run.</p>			
9	April 21, 2016 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services	TUS funding	Traditional use and other budgets and approvals.	<p>Alberta Transportation provided funding for the Tsuut'ina Nation to conduct two TUS and funded a ceremony and feast on the project lands.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation conducted two TUS (21 field days) in summer/fall of 2016/2017. The Tsuut'ina Nation delivered an updated version of their TUS report April 3, 2018 with permission to use it for the project.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation has provided funding to Tsuut'ina for a TUS. Budgets provided in July 2016 and July 2017 were approved by Alberta Transportation. To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 21 site visits by Tsuut'ina within the PDA over the period between the fall of 2016 to the late summer of 2017. A TUS was not received in time to be incorporated in the EIA submitted in October 2017. A draft TUS has now been received however Tsuut'ina's permission to include the information from it in the revised EIA re-submission has not been received.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided Tsuut'ina with the draft Traditional Land and Resource Use EIA (Volumes 3A and 3B) for review and comment under correspondence dated January 26, 2018 and arranged a 4-day workshop with Tsuut'ina from March 1, 5, 6 and 7, 2018. The workshop was facilitated by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) with the goal of better understanding potential impacts to Tsuut'ina from the Project and to provide responses to the concerns</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation stated that because a request for funding to conduct a hydrology study was not funded early in the Project, Tsuut'ina Nation is now having to catch up (with the support of PGL Environmental Consultants) to understand the potential effects on hydrology from the Project.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>raised to date. Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU section has not been updated to include information discussed.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p> <p>As of October 31, 2018, Alberta Transportation has agreed to cover PGL costs for SR1, and have asked for a budget that includes all anticipated costs up to March 31, 2019.</p>			
10	<p>April 3, 2018</p> <p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p>	Traditional Use Study	RECOMMENDATION: Tsuut'ina requires more time during spring/summer to observe waterfowl and plants.	<p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wildlife. Subject to land access from the private landowners, Alberta Transportation agrees to a field visit – similar to the one conducted in October 2017 - with Elders in the spring of 2019 to observe waterfowl. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
11	<p>July 12, 2018</p> <p><i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.</p>	Traditional use	TUS reports for all First Nations should be incorporated into the baseline report and effects assessment.	<p>At the meeting held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated the TUS report will be reviewed against the EIA and a written response will be provided to Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated that information from the TUS report will be used in the regulatory process.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. As the TLRU Report was provided after the filing of the March 2018 EIA, TLRU information, concerns, and recommendations will be used for project planning, consultation and regulatory purposes, where applicable. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
12	<p>May 25, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Violet Meguinis to the Honorable Minister Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation following a May 19, 2017 meeting</p>	Traditional Use Study Ceremony	<p>Recommend an additional traditional land use study be done within blooming season.</p> <p>Need for a ceremony for the well being of all.</p>	<p>In a letter dated June 6, 2017 from Minister Mason, support in principle was provided for Tsuut'ina Consultation technical teams returning to the SR1 (in the blooming season), and the Minister thanked Tsuut'ina for submitting the budget for the site visits. The Minister indicated that his department were reviewing the budgets for the site visits and ceremony and feast.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Funding for a ceremony and feast was provided by Alberta Transportation in July 2016 and February 2018.</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated they held a ceremony involving a feast and a sweat in spring 2018.	None at this time.	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p> <p>Tsuut'ina field work on the second TUS report commenced in early July 2017.</p> <p>A draft portion of their TUS was received in January 2018, but it was requested that it be kept confidential.</p> <p>An updated version of their TUS was received April 3, 2018 with</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>Alberta Transportation has provided funding to Tsuut'ina for a traditional use study. Budgets provided in July 2016 and July 2017 were approved by Alberta Transportation. To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 21 site visits by Tsuut'ina within the PDA over the period between the fall of 2016 to the late summer of 2017. A TUS was not received in time to be incorporated in the EIA submitted in October 2017. A draft TUS has now been received however Tsuut'ina's permission to include the information from it in the revised EIA re-submission has not been received.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided Tsuut'ina with the draft Traditional Land and Resource Use EIS (Volumes 3A and 3B) for review and comment under correspondence dated January 26, 2018 and arranged a 4-day workshop with Tsuut'ina from March 1, 5, 6 and 7, 2018. The workshop was facilitated by CEAA with the goal of better understanding potential impacts to Tsuut'ina from the Project and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date. Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU section has not been updated to include information discussed.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wildlife. Subject to land access from the private landowners, Alberta Transportation agreed to a field visit – similar to the one conducted in October 2017 - with Elders in the spring of 2019 to observe waterfowl. Alberta Transportation committed to funding and participating in ceremonies prior to the start of construction, if requested. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			permission to use it for the SR1 Project.
13	August 31, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation and Tsuut'ina	Ceremony	Tsuut'ina Nation still has a desire to hold a ceremony and feast (the ceremony had been postponed earlier).	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Funding for a ceremony and feast was provided by Alberta Transportation in February 2018.	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated they held a ceremony involving a feast and a sweat in spring 2018.	Funding was provided by Alberta Transportation for a ceremony. Tsuut'ina Nation held the ceremony in spring 2018.	No further action required.
14	April 3, 2018 Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.	Water Ceremony	Concern that the Project will change the relationship between Tsuut'ina and the water in their territory. If Project proceeds, need for a ceremony for the spirit of the water.	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for hydrology. Alberta Transportation committed to funding and participating in ceremonies prior to the start of construction, if requested. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
15	August 31, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation and Tsuut'ina	Historical Resources Ceremony	The Tsuut'ina practiced tree burials with a cairn to mark the spot. Tsuut'ina do not want these cairns disturbed. A ceremony may be needed to properly respect those Tsuut'ina people who were part of the tree burials, but which sites cannot all be identified today.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Funding for a ceremony and feast was provided by Alberta Transportation in July 2016 and February 2018. At the meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation requested the GPS coordinates for the sites identified by Tsuut'ina Nation so they could be plotted against the project components and the potential impacts to the sites could be assessed. At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, historical resources and possible mitigation measures, including following ACT's requirements, monitoring opportunities, using TUS report information, and the potential for more excavation per ACT's direction, were discussed. On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for cultural sites and historical resources, including minimizing disturbance and following ACT guidelines. Alberta Transportation will also maintain access to identified current use sites during construction and operations and develop a protocol for recovery, collection, reporting on, and possible repatriation of artifacts found in consultation with Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation committed to funding and participating in ceremonies prior to the start of construction, if requested. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated they held a ceremony involving a feast and a sweat in spring 2018. At meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018 Tsuut'ina Nation committed to providing the GPS coordinates to Alberta Transportation. As of February 28, 2019, this data has not been provided.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
16	May 14, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018.	Spiritual practices	Effect of the project on experience of the land and spiritual practices has not been assessed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
17	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency May 18, 2017 Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason,	Historical Resources	Concerned about the potential for the Project to adversely affect the physical and cultural heritage resources in Tsuut'ina territory. Concerned about (Tsuut'ina) burial sites that would be destroyed should the reservoir be filled. Concerned about impacts to important cultural sites within	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: An Historic Resources Impact Statement was conducted for the Project and submitted to Alberta Culture and Tourism (ACT) who submitted <i>Historical Resources Act</i> conditions for the Project on November 22, 2017. Existing conditions for historic resources were determined through desktop review and field assessments for archaeology and paleontology. During the historical resources impact assessment (HRIA), 262 shovel tests were completed in areas of high archaeological potential and 698 surface exposures were inspected. A total of 11 precontact period sites and 11 historic	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested information on the process that will occur in the event that a rock cairn, burial, or other significant find is found. Alberta Transportation noted that a protocol regarding site encounters should be established. Tsuut'ina Nation noted that this could potentially form part of a monitoring plan. Tsuut'ina Nation recommended that a monitoring plan be established with ACT. At meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018 Tsuut'ina Nation	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
<p>Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks April 3, 2018</p> <p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc. August 8, 2018</p> <p><i>Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land Use Study Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i></p>		<p>the Project Area (tipi rings, fire pits, etc.).</p> <p>Concerned about impacts to grave sites on the dam outflow and intake/start of diversion channel as well as throughout undisturbed riparian areas. Feel strongly that grave sites need to be protected.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Do not disturb cultural and burial sites, or archaeological sites.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation undertook a site visit and identified tipi rings, a possible medicine wheel, possible campsites, and possible bison jumps (exact locations unclear).</p>	<p>period sites were assessed within the PDA. In summary, the results of the HRIA indicate that the project area does contain some sites of moderate to high heritage value that would require mitigation. However, in general terms, much of the area has been affected previously by cultivation and none of the identified sites have sufficient heritage value to mandate complete avoidance, with the possible exception of the Our Lady Peace Mission site, but that is outside the PDA.</p> <p>ACT considers documentation of the site locations, photography, and collection of a sample of artifacts as sufficient mitigation for sites of low to moderate heritage value. For sites of moderate to high heritage value, avoidance or additional mitigation, such as detailed recording and mitigative excavation to retrieve a larger sample of artifacts and obtain an improved understanding of the cultural affiliation may be required by ACT. Standard mitigation measures will be determined by ACT based on their review of the HRIA.</p> <p>The EIA found no significant effects of the Project on historic resources. A significant adverse residual environmental effect on historic resources is defined as one that results in an unauthorized project-related disturbance to, or destruction of, all or part of a historic resource considered by ACT to be of heritage value, and that is not mitigated or compensated as required by the regulators. The EIA found no significant effects of the Project on historic resources.</p> <p>At the meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation requested the GPS coordinates for the sites identified by Tsuut'ina Nation so they could be plotted against the project components and the potential impacts to the sites could be assessed.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, historical resources and possible mitigation measures, including following ACT's requirements, monitoring opportunities, using TUS report information, and the potential for more excavation per ACT's direction, were discussed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for cultural sites and historical resources, including minimizing disturbance and following ACT guidelines. Alberta Transportation will also maintain access to identified current use sites during construction and operations and develop a protocol for recovery, collection, reporting on, and possible repatriation of artifacts found in consultation with Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	<p>committed to providing the GPS coordinates to Alberta Transportation. As of February 28, 2019, this data has not been provided.</p>		

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
18	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Historical Resources	<p>Concern on project impacts to tipi sites, rock cairns, portions of a medicine wheel.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: As noted in response to the concern above, a full assessment of the effects of the Project on historic resources was carried out and submitted to ACT. The EIA found no significant effects of the Project on historic resources. A significant adverse residual environmental effect on historic resources is defined as one that results in an unauthorized project-related disturbance to, or destruction of, all or part of a historic resource considered by ACT to be of heritage value, and that is not mitigated or compensated as required by the regulators.</p> <p>ACT will define the required mitigation measures required for the Project based on their review of the HRIA, and inform Alberta Transportation of those requirements.</p> <p>At the meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation requested the GPS coordinates for the sites identified by Tsuut'ina Nation so they could be plotted against the project components and the potential impacts to the sites could be assessed.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, historical resources and possible mitigation measures, including following ACT's requirements, monitoring opportunities, using TUS report information, and the potential for more excavation per ACT's direction, were discussed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for cultural sites and historical resources, including minimizing disturbance and following ACT guidelines. Alberta Transportation will also maintain access to identified current use sites during construction and operations and develop a protocol for recovery, collection, reporting on, and possible repatriation of artifacts found in consultation with Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested information on the process that will occur in the event that a rock cairn, burial, or other significant find is found. Alberta Transportation noted that a protocol regarding site encounters should be established. Tsuut'ina Nation noted that this could potentially form part of a monitoring plan. Tsuut'ina Nation recommended that a monitoring plan be established with ACT.</p> <p>At meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018 Tsuut'ina Nation committed to providing the GPS coordinates to Alberta Transportation. As of February 28, 2019, this data has not been provided.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
19	<p>August 8, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	Historic resources	Historic trails and pathways.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
20	<p>April 21, 2016</p> <p>Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services</p> <p>September 21, 2018</p>	Historical Resources	<p>Concerns that their artifacts are not protected.</p> <p>Concerned with the protection of historic resource sites.</p>	<p>After the meeting held on October 28, 2016, Alberta Transportation obtained the information for the Treaty 7 contact at Alberta Culture and Tourism (ACT) that Tsuut'ina Nation could contact directly to request archaeological information. The contact information was included in the draft meeting notes sent December 12, 2016.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested information on the process that will occur in the event that a rock cairn, burial, or other significant find is found. Alberta Transportation noted that a protocol regarding site encounters should be established. Tsuut'ina Nation noted that this could potentially form part of a monitoring plan. Tsuut'ina Nation</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation			<p>March 2018 EIA: ACT independently assesses the heritage value of historic resources, determines the need for, and scope of, any avoidance or mitigation measures, and issues Project approval under the Historical Resources Act. If the Project is approved Alberta Transportation will follow all the requirements for the protection of historic resources as determined by ACT.</p> <p>At the meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation requested the GPS coordinates for the sites identified by Tsuut'ina Nation so they could be plotted against the project components and the potential impacts to the sites could be assessed.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, historical resources and possible mitigation measures, including following ACT's requirements, monitoring opportunities, using TUS report information, and the potential for more excavation per ACT's direction, were discussed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for cultural sites and historical resources, including minimizing disturbance and following ACT guidelines. Alberta Transportation will also maintain access to identified current use sites during construction and operations and develop a protocol for recovery, collection, reporting on, and possible repatriation of artifacts found in consultation with Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	<p>recommended that a monitoring plan be established with ACT.</p> <p>At meetings held on August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018 Tsuut'ina Nation committed to providing the GPS coordinates to Alberta Transportation. As of February 28, 2019, this data has not been provided.</p>		
21	October 28, 2016 Meeting with the Tsuut'ina Nation Consultation Office, Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and DEMA Land Services	Historic Resources Information Sharing	The Tsuut'ina Nation requested that they be informed on all archaeological work being completed on the SR1.	<p>At the meeting held on October 28, 2016, the Stantec archaeologist stated that they were bound by the direction of Alberta Culture and Tourism and any release of information would require their permission. As the archaeological work was still ongoing no information could be released. After the meeting Alberta Transportation obtained and passed on the information for the Treaty 7 contact at ACT that Tsuut'ina Nation could contact directly to request archaeological information. The contact information was included in the draft meeting notes sent December 12, 2016.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: At this time, no further archaeological work is being done on SR1. Work done to date is included in the Historic Resources Section of the revised EIA submission and will be available for review once submitted to and posted by the regulators.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
22	August 31, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation and Tsuut'ina	Historical Resources Information Sharing	Requested the Historical Resource Impact Assessment.	At the meeting held on August 31, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that the HRIA is the responsibility of ACT, and Tsuut'ina Nation can make the request through ACT.	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated they were having difficulty getting in contact with ACT. Tsuut'ina Nation said they would follow up with ACT to request a meeting.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to contacting ACT to ask them to meet with Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation emailed ACT on July 12, 2018, stating that Tsuut'ina Nation would like to meet with ACT. ACT replied July 13, 2018 that they will contact Tsuut'ina Nation.</p>			
23	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>August 8, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p>	Wildlife	<p>Project area is an environmentally sensitive area and includes key wildlife and biodiversity zone and environmentally significant areas.</p> <p>Long term viability of wildlife, species at risk, and biodiversity.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The presence of the Key Wildlife and Biodiversity Zone (KWBZ) along the Elbow River is recognized and addressed in the EIA, as detailed below. The local and regional assessment areas selected for the assessment of effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat overlap areas identified as KWBZs (AEP 2016b), including the Elbow River to the south and the Bow River to the north. KWBZs represent areas along river valleys that are a combination of important winter ungulate (e.g., deer, elk) habitat and areas of high potential for biodiversity (ESRD 2015a; AEP 2016b). KWBZs are areas that protect productive, key ungulate winter ranges and river corridors, protect locally and regionally significant wildlife movement corridors and habitat types, and protect key hiding and thermal cover for wildlife (ESRD 2015a).</p> <p>Information available for the KWBZs was used in the EIA to establish the baseline conditions upon which the effects of the Project would be determined, see Volume 3A and 3B, section 11, and Volume 4, Appendix H.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat were discussed, along with proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wildlife, including mitigation measures for prior to, during, and following construction. Where possible, temporary workspaces will be in areas that avoid wildlife features and construction activities during the restricted activity periods for the KWBZ will be avoided or reduced. A remote camera program will be designed to determine the effectiveness of mitigation implemented throughout the diversion channel. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
24	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>April 3, 2018</p>	Wildlife habitat	<p>Adverse impacts to the habitat of species of cultural significance including bald eagles and grizzly bears.</p> <p>Concerns for how changes to the landscape, including wetlands, will affect deer,</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: One bald eagle nest was observed in the local assessment area near the low-level outlet. A pre-construction survey of the area will be carried out and if the nest is active, the provincially</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p> <p>September 21, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation</p>		<p>grizzly bears, wolves, lynx, bobcat, cougar, bald eagles, beavers, and other species.</p> <p>Concerned about potential impacts to cultural keystone species including beavers, bald eagles, and grizzly bears.</p> <p>Concerned with impacts to wildlife, and wildlife habitat. Animal species are necessary for offerings, prayers, and ceremony. Species Tsuut'ina Nation is concerned about include grizzly bear, black bear, elk, and various other species.</p>	<p>regulated setback distance of 1000m will be observed during the nesting period.</p> <p>The majority (90.4%) of the local assessment area consists of low and very low to nil suitability spring feeding habitat for grizzly bear. Almost all (98.9%) of the local assessment consists of low and very low to nil suitability summer feeding habitat for grizzly bear. High suitability spring feeding habitat for grizzly bear occurs in small areas (<5% of the local assessment area) along the Elbow River, outside of the project development area. No high suitability summer feeding habitat was mapped within the local assessment area. Landowners have observed grizzly bear in the project development area. Radio collared grizzly have been observed in the local and regional assessment areas. Most observations show grizzly using areas west of the Project i.e., Bragg Creek, Jumping Pound and Sibbald Creek.</p> <p>Grizzly bears have large home ranges, so although the Project would reduce suitable spring and summer feeding habitat in the local assessment area, higher suitability grizzly bear habitat occurs west of the Project in the regional assessment area. The construction period will be relatively short, and portions of the construction area would be reclaimed, which would reduce residual effects on spring feeding habitat during dry operations.</p> <p>Most high and moderate suitability feeding habitat in the local assessment area exists along the Elbow River, with patches of moderate suitability habitat existing within the project development area. During a design flood grizzly habitat within the project development area would be temporarily unavailable. During post-flood operations, sediment left behind in the reservoir could reduce forage quality, and partial removal of sediment and sensory disturbance from other maintenance activities would result in displacement of grizzly bear from feeding habitat; however, other areas within the regional assessment area, especially west of the Project (Collister and Kansas 1997; Jorgenson 2016), would provide suitable spring feeding habitat.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat were discussed, along with proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wildlife, including mitigation measures prior to, during, and following construction. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
25	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Wildlife habitat	Construction of the Project may cause loss of wintering ungulate habitat and increase habitat fragmentation in the project area.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Key Wildlife and Biodiversity Zone along the Elbow River provides key ungulate habitat. Habitat modeling undertaken for the EIA determined that approximately 74.5% of the	At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation discussed where the elk are within the area, and noted that "ungulates do not care about fences."	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>May 18, 2017 Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation</p> <p>July 19, 2017 Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p> <p>April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p> <p>July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.</p>		<p>Concerned about the impact that the SR1 would have on the migratory herds of elk that pass through Tsuut'ina territory.</p> <p>Concerns over how disruptions to landscape may affect elk (calving grounds, migration routes, water crossings, and critical habitat). Tsuut'ina members regularly hunt these elk for food and ceremony purposes.</p> <p>Provide regional data and traditional use data as a context for the baseline study results for elk.</p> <p>Potential for project to influence elk movement patterns.</p> <p>Justify the 250 metre and 500 metre road buffers for elk.</p> <p>More detail needed regarding population trends and threats to elk.</p> <p>Concerns about the wildlife corridor.</p>	<p>local assessment area consists of low and very low to nil suitability winter feeding habitat for elk, with the remainder represented by 223.0 ha (4.6%) of high and 1,016.7 ha (20.9%) of moderate suitability habitat. High suitability winter feeding habitat occurs in discrete areas east and west of Highway 22 and along the Elbow River.</p> <p>Construction activities are predicted to result in both a permanent loss of habitat due to the infrastructure footprint and a temporary loss of ungulate habitat due to construction activities and sensory disturbance. A total of approximately 117 ha of high and 377 ha of moderate winter elk feeding habitat would be affected by the Project.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat were discussed, along with proposed mitigation measures. Internal fencing currently within the Project area will be removed. Wildlife friendly fencing will be used around the boundaries of the Project.</p> <p>Under cover dated November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided their report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wildlife, including how ungulate and other wildlife movement will be facilitated. Where possible, temporary workspaces will be in areas that avoid wildlife features and construction activities during the restricted activity periods will be avoided or reduced. A remote camera program will be designed to determine the effectiveness of mitigation implemented throughout the diversion channel. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
26	<p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Wildlife habitat	<p>Habitat damage including sensitive fescue grassland and wetland ecosystems which could result from contaminated sediments from flood waters.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Residual effects on vegetation and wetlands after a flood would not result in the loss of sensitive native upland and wetland plant communities, or wetland functions from the local assessment area, because no vegetation and wetland land units are completely lost, and no lasting effects to vegetation and wetlands would be anticipated as a result of a 1:10 year, 1:100 year or design flood. Effects on one rare plant - slender cress (<i>Rorippa tenerrima</i>) as well as the potential for effects on unidentified plant species of management concern (SOMC) could occur. It is likely that habitat for plant SOMC exists elsewhere in the RAA as affected vegetation and wetland land units exist elsewhere in the RAA (see Volume 3A, Section 10.4). Effects on plant communities of management concern are not anticipated, because none were identified within the RAA.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat, and wetlands were discussed, along with proposed mitigation measures.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for water quality, for both surface and groundwater, and how potential contaminant-related effects will be mitigated. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.			
27	April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.	Wildlife	Concern that the un-named tributary the Project proposes to use to drain the dam is in a low-lying and sheltered valley that is currently used by animals.	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wildlife. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
28	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife	Provide details on monitoring program to monitor project effects on wildlife. Location of remote cameras not provided.	At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat were discussed, along with proposed mitigation measures. Alberta Transportation also indicated they were looking for feedback on the mitigation measures including where remote cameras should be located.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
29	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife	Justify why a 15 kilometre buffer of the project area was chosen for the RAA for wildlife. Clarify why average home range for female grizzly bear was chosen as the RAA for vegetation and wetlands.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
30	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife	Explain why elevation and aspect was not included in the grizzly bear habitat suitability model. Explain why a 500 metre buffer of industrial developments was used in the grizzly bear habitat suitability model.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
31	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental	Wildlife habitat	Recommend a habitat compensation plan be developed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.						
32	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife Wildlife habitat	Definition of significance should include wildlife habitat and biodiversity. Concern that the conclusion of significance is discussed at a high level for wildlife and is not done for each species.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
33	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Wildlife	Summary of the wildlife and biodiversity cumulative effects needed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
34	May 18, 2017 Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation July 19, 2017 Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation	Fish Habitat Wildlife Habitat	Concerned about the destruction of critical fish and wildlife habitat. Concerned about the impacts to fish habitat.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will result in direct and indirect loss of wildlife habitat during construction and dry operations; however, the amount of wildlife habitat permanently affected (168 ha) is relatively small compared to the availability of wildlife habitat remaining in the LAA (4,860 ha). Although there would be temporary displacement and disturbance to wildlife during construction, a measurable change in the abundance of wildlife in the regional assessment area is unlikely. The Project would result in temporarily unavailable wildlife habitat during flood operations and post-flood operations, with some potential permanent loss of wetlands due to sedimentation, which will result in its conversion into upland communities. Vegetation lost during floods would eventually be replaced by self-propagation of native vegetation in the surrounding area, or reestablished through hydroseeding. The amount of wildlife habitat affected is relatively small compared to the availability of wildlife habitat remaining in the regional assessment area (102,817 ha). The Project would result in direct and indirect alteration of fish habitat during construction and dry operations; however, the amount of fish habitat permanently affected (1,854 m ²) is relatively small compared to the availability of fish habitat remaining in the local assessment area (3,100,000 m ²). At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed. There will be habitat compensation, regulated by Fisheries and Oceans Canada. The impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat were also discussed, along with proposed mitigation measures.	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concerns regarding the suitability of new habitat when it is established to compensate for the loss of habitat.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and wildlife, including mitigation measures for prior to, during, and following construction. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
35	<p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Fish habitat	<p>Impacts to spawning beds, used by various trout species.</p> <p>Concerns related to significant changes to these waterbodies and local ecosystem and the permanent destruction of fish habitat.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA addressed potential impacts to spawning beds by considering the potential impact to fish habitat.</p> <p>The Project will result in the permanent loss of 1,854 m² fish habitat at the diversion structure. This area has been identified as suitable foraging habitat for trout including, mountain whitefish, brown trout and rainbow trout. The area that will be lost is small compared to the habitat available within the local assessment area, which is approximately 3,100,000 m².</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed. There will be habitat compensation, regulated by Fisheries and Oceans Canada.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and fishing, including mitigation measures prior to, during, and following construction. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concerns regarding the suitability of new habitat when it is established to compensate for the loss of habitat.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
36	<p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Fish Habitat	<p>Impacts to overwintering habitat to fish that includes scoured pools in the Elbow River.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Hydrological modeling, undertaken for the EIA, indicates that during dry operations, there would be no changes to flows in the Elbow River and no changes to the pattern of erosion and deposition in bars or pools. Given this there would be no changes expected to the maintenance of spawning or overwintering habitat in the Elbow River for salmonid species. Hydrological modelling also indicates that there would be no significant changes in sediment transport (Volume 3A, Section 6.5.3 of the EIA), and therefore that there would be no alterations to the quality of fish habitat, including for fish that support Aboriginal fisheries.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and fishing, including mitigation measures prior to, during, and following construction. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.			
37	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Fish	Concerns fish may not be able to pass through diversion channel during operation.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: During Project design it was recognized that the diversion structure could result in an increase in flow rates of the Elbow River at the structure and potentially affect the ability of fish to pass upstream. In order to avoid affecting fish passage design elements were incorporated to ensure that under normal river conditions flow rates are maintained within the range suitable for fish passage.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed. During flood scenarios, fish will be able to pass through the diversion channel. Post-flood monitoring for stranded fish and fish rescue will occur if needed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and fishing, including mitigation measures for prior to, during, and following construction. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish. A monitoring program will be undertaken to identify if fish passage is impeded. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
38	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Fish	<p>Fish could be carried into the Diversion Structure and into the Reservoir and become stranded when water released.</p> <p>Fish and fish habitat: mitigation for salvaging; if there is fish rescue will the Nation be included; alteration and destruction of fish habitat; Treaty right to fish must be protected.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: During a flood event it is anticipated that fish will pass into the diversion structure and into the reservoir. After a flood, the water flows in the diversion channel will be gradually reduced and the reservoir slowly drained to facilitate the movement of fish from the reservoir, back to the Elbow River with the receding water. The outlet will be designed and operated in a manner that allows fish egress out of the reservoir, downstream into the outlet channel. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish during release of stored flood water from the reservoir. During draining of the reservoir, monitoring will be undertaken to identify isolated pools and the potential that fish may become stranded. If potential fish stranding is identified, a fish rescue program will be undertaken to return the fish to the river.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed. During flood scenarios, fish will be able to pass through the diversion</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested training and communication plans in the event of fish stranding.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>channel. Post-flood monitoring for stranded fish and fish rescue will occur if needed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and fishing, including mitigation measures for prior to, during, and following construction. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish. A monitoring program will be undertaken to identify if fish passage is impeded. Mitigation also includes development of a land use plan. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
39	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Fish	<p>Disruption to fish migration in Elbow River during construction of the Diversion Structure.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: In compliance with Regulatory requirements (Fisheries Act and the Water Act) and to allow construction of the Diversion structure in the dry, the current river channel flow will be routed around the construction work by excavating a bypass channel and temporarily diverting the river flow through this channel. This will provide unimpeded fish passage both upstream and downstream of the construction work.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed. A channel will be put in to ensure fish passage during construction. During construction, the extent and duration of instream work will be minimized.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and fishing, including mitigation measures prior to, during, and following construction. Restricted Activity Periods will be adhered to during construction and the Elbow River will be temporarily diverted during instream construction to allow for fish passage. A monitoring program will be undertaken to identify if fish passage is impeded. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
40	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Fish	<p>Impact to fish migration while reservoir is holding water.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: During the diversion of flood water from Elbow River to the off-stream reservoir, it is assumed that fish, at any of their lifestages present, may encounter the diversion structure.</p> <p>During floods, flows of approximately 160 m³/s, which are close to the 1:10 year flood would continue in Elbow River downstream of the diversion structure. These flows are considered channel forming and</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>would shift bed materials which would maintain overwintering and spawning habitat and shallow side-channel and nearshore rearing habitats. Brown trout, brook trout, and mountain whitefish spawn in the fall, and therefore should not be undergoing migration movements during the potential operational period of the diversion structure (May-June of a flood year), although immature individuals may encounter the diversion when young disperse to rearing habitats.</p> <p>Given the low probability of the design flood and the 1:100 year flood, the reduction in magnitude of erosion and deposition is unlikely to occur at a frequency to negatively affect overwintering habitat, such as the scouring of pools and deeper runs for trout species, nor negatively affect spawning habitat in the in Elbow River. Because flows in Elbow River would be less during active water diversion (compared to flows without the Project), fish migration in Elbow River at the diversion structure should not be impeded any more than during the dry operation condition, which has been modelled to show that upstream fish passage is possible.</p> <p>During natural flooding, fish species may seek side channels and lower velocity flooded riparian areas, then return to the main river channel as flood water recedes. It is unlikely that fish are migrating upstream during the high flow situations when the diversion would be operational.</p> <p>The Elbow River would return to normal flow patterns over the summer period, and with gradually reducing water levels in the reservoir and grading that avoids the formation of pooled areas, fish should be able to move out of the reservoir with receding water.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, a discussion was held regarding boulder berms that would be placed near the diversion structure to aid fish movement.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed. During flood scenarios, fish will be able to pass through the diversion channel. Post-flood monitoring for stranded fish and fish rescue will occur if needed. There will be instream components (e.g., boulder clusters) to slow the water and allow fish to move upstream.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and fishing, including mitigation measures for prior to, during, and following construction. Drainage areas within the reservoir will be graded to reduce stranding of fish. A monitoring program will be undertaken to identify if fish passage is impeded. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
41	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian	Fish Fish Habitat	Diversion of Highway 22 and bridge construction could lead	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The optimal design option for Highway 22 does not	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Environmental Assessment Agency		to impacts to fish and fish habitat.	involve diversion of the Highway. The Highway will be raised to above the design flood level, and culverts inserted to prevent the highway from flooding. A new bridge will be required where Highway 22 crosses the diversion channel. The effects of the highway modifications and bridge have been considered within the EIA. With the implementation of mitigation measures no impacts to fish and fish habitat are predicted. At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed. On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for fish and fishing, including mitigation measures for prior to, during, and following construction. Restricted Activity Periods will be adhered to during construction and the Elbow River will be temporarily diverted during instream construction to allow for fish passage. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.			
42	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Fish	Temperature changes to the Elbow River from water being released from the reservoir could be harmful to fish.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: There is a potential that the temperature of the flood water held within the reservoir may increase during the time the water is retained within the reservoir. The amount of temperature change would depend upon a number of factors including water volume, air temperature, wind regime and residency time. As the water from the reservoir is then released, it would mix with Elbow River water and potentially increase water temperature in the river. If a change in temperature did occur, it would be expected to be temporary and localized due to the rapid mixing with the Elbow River water. Effects to fish as a result of any localized and temporary changes in water temperature are not predicted. At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to fish and fish habitat, along with the proposed mitigation measures, were discussed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
43	May 14, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018.	Fish habitat	Baseline distribution for available fish habitat has not been provided.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
44	December 6, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta	Fish	Concerned about the spread of whirling disease.	At the meeting held on December 6, 2018, Alberta Transportation responded that there is an Alberta Environment and Parks policy in effect to prevent basin to basin transfer of whirling disease. Alberta Transportation will comply with this policy for the SR1 project.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Transportation, and Stantec.						
45	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Birds Bird Habitat	Debris left after floods may result in loss of bird habitat, or contamination of habitat.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: During a design flood, sediment modeling predicts that 3.7% (192.6 ha in the reservoir) of the local assessment area would be covered by sediment that is less than 3 cm deep, and 0.8% (37.4 ha) would be covered by sediment between 3 cm and 10 cm. Details of the sediment modeling is provided in the EIA. The quality of vegetation and wetlands post- flood would differ from baseline conditions, however, changes to overall wildlife habitat abundance and suitability would be minor under these conditions. Sediment less than 3 cm thick would have little to no effect on vegetation and wetlands, whereas sediment 3-10 cm deep could result in small shifts in plant species composition within upland ecosites, but complete changes to upland communities would not be expected. For wetlands, sediment 3-10 cm deep would likely alter plant composition and abundance resulting in wetlands changing to upland sites, however as noted above this level of sediment deposition would occur in less than 1% of the local assessment area.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
46	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Birds	Explain using a seven day window for conducting a nest survey.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
47	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation	Birds Wetlands	Use of the Storage Dam would cause loss of migratory bird nests and temporarily reduce wetland habitat for breeding, nesting while flood water is stored in Reservoir. Concerned with possible impacts to bird nests along the river.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The design flood, (i.e. 1 in 200 year) is predicted to cover 816 ha in the reservoir. Flood operations during the design flood would temporarily impact 14.8% (234.2 ha) of breeding and foraging habitat in native upland vegetation, and 23.7% (70.3 ha) of wetland habitat in the LAA. Although these habitats would be temporarily unavailable to wildlife, the regional assessment area provides grassland, shrubland, tame pasture, and wetland habitat in other locations. Overall, the design flood would cover less than 3% of available native grassland (27,916 ha) and tame pasture (9,716 ha), and less than 1% of available wetland habitat (973 ha) in the regional assessment area. At the meeting held on September 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated they will complete pre-construction nest sweeps and buffer bird nests based on recommendations from AEP. At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wetlands and proposed mitigation measures were discussed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
48	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Wetlands	<p>Construction of the Diversion Channel and Reservoir in wetland areas could cause loss of those wetlands.</p> <p>Noted Alberta Wetlands Policy indicating the preferred response for mitigation is to avoid all impacts on wetlands.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Wetlands are widely dispersed in the local assessment area, but most occur along drainages and adjacent to the Elbow River. A large wetland occurs just north of Highway 1, a temporary marsh; however, most graminoid marshes are small scattered ponds with an average size of 0.68 ha, occurring mainly in agriculture land. Approximately 312 ha of the local assessment area contains wetland cover types. Wetland ecological function (i.e., wildlife habitat and plant diversity) would be altered due to vegetation clearing for permanent structures. Dry operations would result in the loss of 8 ha of estimated high value wetland area and 13 ha of moderate wetland area in the local assessment area. No vegetation and wetland land units are completely lost, and therefore no significant effects on vegetation and wetlands are predicted.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wetlands and proposed mitigation measures were discussed. Wetlands will be compensation as per the Alberta Wetlands Policy.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wetlands, including avoiding natural vegetation such as wetlands where possible, and reclaiming temporary work spaces with native species. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested that wetlands be considered within the hydrology assessment.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
49	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Wetlands	Wetlands and sensitive ecosystems including grasslands, could be adversely affected. Changes to wetlands from construction or operations of the Project may affect how the wetlands function.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: During a flood event it is predicted that wetlands within the project development area will be temporarily inundated with flood water. A design flood i.e., maximum flood, is predicted to temporarily affect: 3.7ha of high value wetland habitat, 7.1 ha of moderate value habitat and 1.2 ha of low value habitat.</p> <p>The wetland functions of habitat, plant and wildlife, and hydrology would likely be reduced in these areas as plant composition may be changed and cover reduced, at least for a growing season, and lower-class marsh and swamp wetlands would be flooded for a duration and depth beyond natural variation, i.e., a few days to a few weeks. Residual Project effects to community diversity, traditional plant use and wetland functions are not anticipated because plant communities are expected to recover once the reservoir has been drained. Residual effects on vegetation and wetlands after a flood would not result in the loss of native upland and wetland plant communities, or wetland functions from the local assessment area.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the impacts to wetlands and proposed mitigation measures were discussed.</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested that wetlands be considered within the hydrology assessment.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for wetlands, including avoiding natural vegetation such as wetlands where possible, and reclaiming temporary work spaces with native species. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.			
50	May 14, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018.	Wetlands	Wetlands of concern to Tsuut'ina Nation have not been identified.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
51	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Wetlands	How is direct/indirect loss or alteration of surface or groundwater flow patterns being measured with respect to wetland function?	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
52	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Vegetation Wetlands	Confirm if a monitoring plan for post-construction and post-flood conditions will be developed to monitor reclaimed areas (vegetation and wetlands).	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . Alberta Transportation will participate in discussions regarding possible monitoring opportunities. Temporary work spaces will be reclaimed incorporating input on native species to be used for reclamation from Tsuut'ina Nation and other Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
53	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Vegetation	Planting native shrub and tree species should be considered to mitigate the change in species diversity and loss of native vegetation communities. Mitigation should include developing management plan to prevent spread of regulated weeds. Provide an invasive species management plan.	At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the mitigation measure of using native seed mixes for reclamation was discussed.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
54	July 12, 2018	Vegetation	Clarify the claim that native communities may be altered but	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.		areas would not be lost as a result of filling and draining the reservoir.				
55	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Vegetation Traditional use	Long term loss of traditional use plants in flooded areas not considered. Justify assessment of potential loss of rare plants.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
56	April 21, 2016 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.	Plants Medicinal and ceremonial plants	There are plants they harvest in the SR1 area. Medicinal and ceremonial plants are found within the project area. Tsuut'ina Nation is concerned that plants, such as sweetgrass, are becoming harder to find. Concerns about impacts to medicinal and cultural plants that cannot be found elsewhere, including barriers to access, habitat loss, changes in abundance/availability, etc.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation will provide opportunities for harvesting or relocating medicinal and ceremonial plants prior to construction. Vegetation will be cleared from the project development area during construction. However, effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in the loss of traditionally used species in the local assessment area. The effects on plants and traditional use are assessed in the EIA in Volume 3A and 3B, sections 10 and 14. At the meetings held on September 21, 2018 and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed future land use planning and asked Tsuut'ina Nation to think about how they would like to see the lands used. At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the mitigation measure of allowing opportunities for Indigenous groups to harvest traditional plants prior to construction was discussed. On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for vegetation and plant harvesting, including providing access to harvest plants prior to construction, maintaining access to current use sites during construction and operations, and avoiding native vegetation, where possible. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
57	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian	Plants Traditional use	Impact to plant harvesting, including medicinal plants that grow on sensitive riparian areas	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Some plant species would be removed from the	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Environmental Assessment Agency		of the Elbow River, its tributaries and wetlands.	<p>project development area during clearing activities. There is potential for a reduction in riparian and wetland areas as well as altered wetland conditions due to clearing. However, the effects of the Project are not anticipated to result in a loss of species or a loss in wetland function overall within the local assessment area. Although individual plants would be removed from the project development area, none of the traditionally used species identified, during the aboriginal engagement program and through publicly available traditional ecological knowledge reports, would be lost in the local assessment area, nor would vegetation communities supporting traditionally used plants be lost from the project development area.</p> <p>In the event of a flood, there would be mortality of traditional plant use species found in upland plant communities within the flooded area of the reservoir. Because these species are common and widespread, and based on visual observance of plant recovery lost as a result of previous flood events, re-establishment of these species will occur by natural recruitment over time. Therefore, permanent loss of traditional plant use species is not anticipated.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, the mitigation measure of allowing opportunities for Indigenous groups to harvest traditional plants prior to construction was discussed.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for vegetation and plant harvesting, including providing access to harvest plants prior to construction, maintaining access to current use sites during construction and operations, and avoiding native vegetation, where possible. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
58	May 14-15, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.	Soil Odour	Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concerns that following a flood there will be a smell in the dry reservoir and the soil will be dried and crack.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
59	April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i>	Disturbance	<p>Concern that the few unaltered forested areas within the project area provide important habitat and shelter for wildlife.</p> <p>Extremely important that undisturbed areas remain untouched for future</p>	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for vegetation, including avoiding native vegetation, where possible. Temporary work spaces will be reclaimed incorporating input on native species to be used for reclamation from Tsuut'ina Nation and other	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.		generations and to ensure Tsuut'ina culture is not erased. RECOMMENDATION: Do not disturb few remaining forested areas.	Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.			
60	<p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency May 18, 2017 Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation July 19, 2017 Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks November 1, 2017 Technical overview for the EIA with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec. April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc. October 11, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation May 14, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental</p>	Groundwater Spring water Hydrology	<p>Concerns that the SR1 Project may impact groundwater in the Elbow River Alluvial Aquifer.</p> <p>Concerns water stored in the Reservoir may cause an increase in aquifer pressures, altering local groundwater flow regime.</p> <p>Concerns related to SR1 on Tsuut'ina's ground and surface water.</p> <p>Concerned about groundwater effects to Tsuut'ina land.</p> <p>Concerned about impacts to spring and groundwater, including contamination and barriers to access at traditional gathering sites.</p> <p>Concern for the spring water within the Project Area.</p> <p>Concern that Project will further reduce and otherwise impact water flow on reserve lands.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the hydrogeology model.</p> <p>The rationale behind spatial scoping decisions was insufficient.</p> <p>Hydrogeologic model does not include Tsuut'ina lands.</p> <p>Impacts to groundwater resources have not been assessed on Tsuut'ina lands.</p> <p>Groundwater model needs to be improved to predict potential effects on Tsuut'ina lands.</p> <p>Groundwater model fails to predict potential effects on Tsuut'ina IR 145 and</p>	<p>At the meeting held on November 1, 2017, Stantec's river engineer discussed the concern with Tsuut'ina Nation. The height of the diversion structure and floodplain berm, and the gradient of the Elbow River in that area combine to ensure that flood water could not back up onto the Tsuut'ina reserve as a result of operating the diversion.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The EIA considered the effects of the Project on both surface water (Volume 3A and 3B, section 6) and groundwater, including the Alluvial Aquifer (Volumes 3A and 3B, section 5, Appendix I).</p> <p>The assessment used a complex numerical groundwater model (FEFLOW) to evaluate potential changes to the hydrogeologic system, including aquifer pressure, caused by floods and construction and operation of the Project. The results of a series of the modeling scenarios showed that the groundwater levels and flow patterns are altered within the vicinity of the proposed Project. Changes are observed within the reservoir area during flooding and recede toward pre-flood conditions following floods. Changes in the groundwater flow regime are also observed along the proposed diversion channel. The model results were used as the basis for the EIA. The assessment concluded that effects to groundwater quantity and quality would not be significant.</p> <p>The residual effects on groundwater quantity from the Project are assessed as not significant because they would not decrease the yield of groundwater supply wells to the point where they can no longer be used. The residual effects on groundwater quality from the Project are assessed as not significant because changes in groundwater quality at existing wells would not deteriorate to the point where it becomes non-potable or cannot meet the Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality for a consecutive period exceeding 30 days (for those parameters which don't already, under existing conditions, exceed those guidelines). Effects to groundwater would be limited to the local assessment area.</p> <p>At the meetings held On May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to revising the hydrogeological model to include the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve.</p> <p>In a letter dated July 20, 2018, Alberta Transportation advised Tsuut'ina Nation that, based on the comments by PGL Environmental, they are revisiting the hydrogeological modelling. The southern boundary is</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation questioned the boundaries of the study area for the hydrogeologic model in the EIA, and recommended the boundaries of the study area be enlarged to include the Tsuut'ina reserve. Especially noted concerns regarding the assessment not including water wells on the reserve.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation recommended that a Water Needs Assessment be conducted to understand the potential effects from the Project; Tsuut'ina Nation noted that this should be conducted with the standards of a Parkland Management Zone, not industry standards.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation requested that more information on the hydrogeological sensitivity analyses that were conducted be shared.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation recommended a revenue package in the event that water is affected.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation stated that once a baseline assessment that understands the potential effects on Tsuut'ina Nation has been completed, only then can there be discussions regarding monitoring, further mitigation, etc.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation recommended that a rescoping of the hydrogeology regional assessment area be completed to include the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested further work to drill new wells on Tsuut'ina land believing it will result in the hydrogeologic model more accurately showing conditions on Tsuut'ina land.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 21, 2019, Tsuut'ina Nation remained concerned with the use of the data from the wells on reserve in the numeric modelling. They feel the data lacks the accuracy to be used for the hydrogeological model. Tsuut'ina Nation would like new wells to be drilled on reserve so the hydrogeologic model</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018.</p> <p>July 12, 2018</p> <p><i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.</p> <p>February 21, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation and Alberta Transportation</p> <p>February 28, 2019</p> <p>Letter from Tanis Onespot to Alberta Transportation</p>		<p>contradicts current understanding of the Elbow River watershed.</p> <p>The perimeter boundary conditions are not well described. The southern boundary should be expanded to include Tsuut'ina IR 145 and numerical groundwater model reconstructed.</p> <p>Install monitoring wells on Tsuut'ina IR 145 to calibrate numerical groundwater model.</p> <p>Conduct water well survey of Tsuut'ina private water wells and monitor prior to and during construction and dry operations, to assess well interference.</p> <p>Run numerical groundwater model simulations that predicts potential effects from construction dewatering.</p> <p>Uncertainty analyses should be completed in the revised numerical groundwater model report.</p> <p>Add bedrock heterogeneities and fractured bedrock to the conceptual hydrostratigraphic framework.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation's proposed approach of using existing borehole data (for the hydrogeological model) is not sufficient as these records are not complete, reliable, or up to date. This work needs to be completed before impacts can be understood and addressed.</p>	<p>being extended to account for Tsuut'ina Nation's concerns regarding potential impact to groundwater on and near the reserve.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 8, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided an explanation of the additional work being done on the hydrogeological model. The study area has been expanded to include the Tsuut'ina reserve and well records from the reserve are being incorporated. A new baseline is being created and then the hydrogeological model will be re-run.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided an update on the work being done on the hydrogeologic model. An additional 1850 wells from the Tsuut'ina reserve have been added. The additional work has confirmed the Elbow River as a hydrogeologic divide.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for surface water, groundwater, hydrogeology, and hydrology, and how potential contaminant-related effects will be mitigated. Alberta Transportation also provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for traditional use, including development of a land use plan. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 21, 2019, Alberta Transportation detailed the additional work that has been done with the hydrogeological model. Results of the updated modelling will be provided to Tsuut'ina Nation. Alberta Transportation and Stantec have initiated the groundwater monitoring plan and the plan is currently in development. Alberta Transportation explained their reasoning for choosing the wells they did, and committed to providing information on the wells and information used to Tsuut'ina Nation.</p>	<p>is more accurate, and for pre- and post-flood monitoring.</p>		
61	<p>May 14-15, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta</p>	Hydrogeology	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concern that the potential impacts to Tsuut'ina Nation have not been adequately predicted and sensitivity models were not done.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated that they had done some sensitivity analyses, and these are explained in the hydrology report. Alberta Transportation also indicated that in some areas doing increased sensitivity analysis does not provide increased value. Alberta Transportation committed to looking into further sensitivity models.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated they recommend further sensitivity analyses.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.</p> <p>May 14, 2018</p> <p><i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018.</p> <p>July 12, 2018</p> <p><i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.</p>		<p>A full hydrogeological modelling report with sensitivity analyses has not been provided.</p> <p>Remodel flood simulations and conduct sensitivity analysis on the model results by introducing high permeability windows into the reservoir base.</p> <p>Conduct and report particle tracking simulations and conduct sensitivity analyses on the particle tracking using high permeability windows.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Stantec indicated they are working on the sensitivity analysis for the hydrogeological modelling.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 21, 2019, Alberta Transportation detailed the additional work that has been done with the hydrogeological model. A sensitivity analysis was done for the original model, and in response to concerns raised by PGL Environmental, will be conducted on the new expanded model. The results will be presented in the addendum report to be filed with the SIR responses.</p>			
62	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Groundwater	<p>Concerns that there is no plan to line the Reservoir, which causes concerns that any contaminants would seep into the groundwater.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Given the nature of the Project, the hydrogeological conditions in the area and the sediment composition within the reservoir area, the potential for contamination of groundwater sources as a result of seepage from flood waters is not predicted. Accordingly, there is no plan to line the reservoir.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested that the region be modelled over a 20-30 year life cycle to understand the long-term effects of erosion.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
63	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p> <p>February 28, 2019</p>	Hydrology	<p>Concerns that the permanent structure in the Elbow River will permanently change the flow of the river and tributaries.</p> <p>Concerned SR1 would permanently change the flow of the Elbow River.</p> <p>The project will permanently change the course of the Elbow River.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Diversion Structure will have minimal effect on the flow of the Elbow River or its course downstream when constructed. The three additional streams refer to small ephemeral streams that flow only part of the time. During construction of the diversion channel, the unnamed tributary (ID 1350) would be diverted into the diversion channel. Approximately 1,200 m of the tributary would be destroyed, with the lowest 300 m being fish habitat that would be lost. The loss of the 300 m of habitat in the tributary could be offset by the enhancement or construction of side channel habitat on the Elbow River that could provide rearing habitat for salmonids and cover for small-bodied fish.</p> <p>The Project is designed to reduce the changes to the course of the river during extreme floods. The channel of the Elbow River experiences seasonal changes in flows. Such changes are greater during flood events. As discussed in Volume 3B, Section 6.4.4, the presence of the Project would decrease the amount of deposition and erosion of the channel bed during extreme flood events, compared to changes without the Project. Channel form and bedload (river bed particles) movement</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested that wetlands be considered within the hydrology assessment.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Letter from Tanis Onspot to Alberta Transportation			during extreme floods would remain the same with or without the Project. The Project is assessed as not resulting in significant changes to the Elbow River or local ecosystem. The diversion structure is designed to allow fish passage under all conditions.			
64	August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Riparian areas	What is the plan for riparian areas.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
65	August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Downstream effects	Downstream effects during drainage.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
66	August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Construction Water	Impacts to water during construction.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
67	August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Water quality	Water quality during drawdown.	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for water quality, for both surface and groundwater, and how potential contaminant-related effects will be mitigated. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
68	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Debris and contamination from flood Impacts to Reserve	Potential for flood waters to back up onto the Reserve, including debris or contamination. This occurred in in the 2013 flood. Potential for flood waters to spill over the Floodplain Berm and onto the reserve, carrying with them any contamination and debris. With global warming, higher flood volumes, or more frequent flood events, than predicted in the Project Description are possible.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: No back up of water onto Tsuut'ina Reserve is expected, including debris and contamination. The Project will provide flood protection for communities and lands downstream of the diversion structure, including the northeastern part of the Tsuut'ina Reserve that is located downstream of the diversion structure. During a flood event, it is expected that some water will "back-up" upstream of the diversion structure. However, modeling studies have shown that the "back-up" of water would not reach the Tsuut'ina Reserve upstream even in a 2013 design flood event. At its closest point the back-up water would be approximately 1,130 m from the Reserve Volume 3A, Section 18, Figure 18-3. In the event the diversion structure does not operate properly, and water continually backs up behind the structure, the auxiliary spillway and floodplain berm have been designed with a low point that will allow flood water to pass over the berm and continue downstream, thereby preventing back up flooding.	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested confirmation that 930 m is the closest extent of the Project to the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve. Tsuut'ina Nation requested the opportunity to see the conceptual Project model.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided the following clarification in relation to the map provided to Tsuut'ina Nation indicating potential water "back up" behind the diversion structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The blue line on the map indicates the anticipated surface water back up of flood water behind the diversion structure in a flood event when the gates are in operation and working correctly. This water back up reaches a point approximately 1680 m from the Tsuut'ina Nation reserve if measured following the active river channel or 1130 m if measured directly south over land. 2. The closest extent of the physical infrastructure to the Tsuut'ina reserve boundary is 1130 m. 3. The red dash line on the figure represents the Project Development Area. This line is a conservation buffer. It represents the maximum extent of potential surface water "back up" in the event the diversion structure malfunctions. Should the service spillway gates close but the diversion gates fail to open water would "back up" behind the service spillway and floodplain berm. The red line indicates the maximum extent to which water would back up before it reached the height of the flood plain berm. At this point the flood water would overtop the flood plain berm. The distance of 930 m indicated on the map was measured within the active channel. <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation showed videos and images of the 1:16 model of the SR1 Project design to demonstrate the engineering of the Project and how water and debris would flow. A USB flash drive with these videos and images was sent to Tsuut'ina Nation under cover dated August 28, 2018.</p>			
69	<p>April 3, 2018</p> <p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p>	<p>Contamination</p> <p>Impact to Reserve</p> <p>Traditional territory</p> <p>Fish</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <p>Vegetation</p>	<p>Concerned that impacts to reserve lands from contaminated flood waters will include changes to health and cleanliness of traditional resources of reserve lands.</p> <p>Concerns about the quality of floodwaters that may be diverted through Tsuut'ina traditional territory and held by the project (e.g., chemicals from farms in the area).</p> <p>Concerns that stranding water in the reservoir could contaminate plants, animals, fish, and threaten Tsuut'ina food and cultural food security.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: No back up of water onto Tsuut'ina Reserve is expected, including debris and contamination.</p> <p>The Project will provide flood protection for communities and lands downstream of the diversion structure, including the northeastern part of the Tsuut'ina Reserve that is located downstream of the diversion structure. During a flood event, it is expected that some water will "back-up" upstream of the diversion structure. However, modeling studies have shown that the "back-up" of water would not reach the Tsuut'ina Reserve upstream even in a 2013 design flood event. At its closest point the back-up water would be approximately 1,130 m from the Reserve Volume 3A, Section 18, Figure 18-3.</p> <p>In the event the diversion structure does not operate properly, and water continually backs up behind the structure, the auxiliary spillway and floodplain berm have been designed with a low point that will allow</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>flood water to pass over the berm and continue downstream, thereby preventing back up flooding.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for water quality, for both surface and groundwater, and how potential contaminant-related effects will be mitigated. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
70	<p>May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p>	Debris	Concerns regarding debris and contamination following a flood event.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: During a design flood, sediment modeling predicts that 3.7% (192.6 ha in the reservoir) of the local assessment area would be covered by sediment that is less than 3 cm deep, and 0.8% (37.4 ha) would be covered by sediment between 3 cm and 10 cm. Details of the sediment modeling is provided in the EIA. The quality of vegetation and wetlands post- flood would differ from baseline conditions, however, changes to overall wildlife habitat abundance and suitability would be minor under these conditions. Sediment less than 3 cm thick would have little to no effect on vegetation and wetlands, whereas sediment 3-10 cm deep could result in small shifts in plant species composition within upland ecosites, but complete changes to upland communities would not be expected. For wetlands, sediment 3-10 cm deep would likely alter plant composition and abundance resulting in wetlands changing to upland sites, however as noted above this level of sediment deposition would occur in less than 1% of the local assessment area.</p> <p>Given the nature of the project, the hydrogeological conditions in the area and the sediment composition within the reservoir area, the potential for contamination of groundwater sources as a result of seepage from flood waters is not predicted. Accordingly, there is no plan to line the reservoir.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation showed videos and images of the 1:16 model of the SR1 Project design to demonstrate the engineering of the Project and how water and debris would flow. A USB flash drive with these videos and images was sent to Tsuut'ina Nation under cover dated August 28, 2018.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for water quality, for both surface and groundwater, and how potential contaminant-related effects will be mitigated. The service spillway is designed to pass debris during flood operations and will be monitored. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested the opportunity to see the conceptual Project model.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				At the meeting held on December 6, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated that the future land use in SR1 will include debris and sedimentation management. Alberta Transportation indicated it wants to work with Indigenous groups to determine how the area is reclaimed.			
71	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Contamination Upstream and downstream effects	Potential for methylmercury contamination both upstream and downstream.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Filling the off-stream reservoir with water would initiate the process of mercury methylation; however, accumulation of methylmercury in aquatic environments to levels that are hazardous can take many years and depends on several factors (e.g., net methylation rates, sources of mercury, and sources of organic matter for microbial activity). Large, permanent reservoirs and dams are known for having elevated concentrations of methylmercury because of increased conversion rates. Elevated levels of methylmercury combined with bioaccumulation can lead to higher health hazards for wildlife, especially piscivorous (fish-eating) species. However, as the Project is a dry dam with limited water residency times when in use, methylmercury accumulation is not considered to be a risk. Modeling of low and high uptake rates of methylmercury in all Project flood scenarios are below the CCME Canadian Water Quality Guideline for the Protection of Aquatic Life. The reservoir area is not expected to continue to contribute methylmercury after it is drained.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for water quality, for both surface and groundwater, and how potential contaminant-related effects will be mitigated. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated that the response in Table 7-3 responds to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.
72	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Sediment	Downstream sedimentation in the Elbow River and tributaries during construction and operation.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: A site-specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be developed by the selected construction contractor as part of the project-specific construction plan, and implemented during the various phases of the Project's construction and should include site-specific mitigation measures to suit the site and finalized design and construction plans.</p> <p>During operation suspended sediment in the Elbow River would be expected to decrease slightly as water is diverted into the reservoir. Suspended sediment concentration in the diverted water decreases rapidly, and most suspended sediment would remain in the reservoir after discharge back to Elbow River. Suspended sediment concentration is predicted to increase during the last few days of discharge because of sediment re-mobilization in the reservoir and sediment mobilization in the low-level outlet. However, it is anticipated that this increase in suspended sediment concentration can be</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				mitigated with the operation of the low-level outlet and with physical sediment barriers.			
73	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>October 11, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation</p>	<p>Noise</p> <p>Dust</p> <p>Air Pollution</p>	<p>Noise, dust and air pollution during construction.</p> <p>Sediment and dust after a flood.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Noise, dust and air pollution levels will be monitored in compliance with regulatory requirements and the Project specific ECO Plan. The effects of noise, dust and air pollution during construction are also addressed in the EIA, Volumes 3A and 3B sections 3 and 4.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated they can share a copy of the ECO Plan framework, but noted that a project-specific ECO plan is developed by the successful construction contractor.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation responded that there will be sediment deposition in the reservoir after a flood.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation reported that members living near the Project area will not be used to these types of changes and inquired whether there will be compensation for residents affected by this.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
74	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	<p>Air Quality</p>	<p>Concern of potential impacts to air quality from the Project, including the potential for contaminated dry dust (for example with raw sewage) to be carried by the wind from the Project area.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Air quality data was collected for the Project and an air quality assessment was carried out as part of the EIA. The results, presented in Volumes 3A and 3B, Section 3, found the Project would have no significant effects on air quality.</p> <p>The main sources of air emissions due to the Project construction are vehicle exhaust and fugitive. As these emissions result from ground based sources, the greatest air quality changes due to these emissions occur inside and near the project development area, decreasing to background levels with increasing distance from the project development area. The main finding is the potential for dust concentrations to be greater than the regulatory criteria outside the project development area. Since estimated dust emissions are rated "indeterminate", the assessment does indicate the need for ambient monitoring during construction to confirm if the adopted dust control mitigation is adequate. On this basis, Alberta Transportation plans to implement an air quality monitoring and record keeping program to provide appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The only potential source of fugitive dust during post-flood operations is wind erosion of deposited sediments in the reservoir after they dry out, and when strong wind conditions occur. Because these emissions are ground based, the greatest air quality changes due to these emissions occur inside and near the project development area, decreasing to background levels with increasing distance from the project development. The main finding of the modeling is the potential for dust concentrations to be greater than the regulatory criteria outside the project development area. However, given the low recurrence of the floods that result in sediment deposition (i.e. 100 years and design flood [200 years]) and the proposed mitigation measures, it is expected</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation noted that Indigenous Inclusion planning and monitoring should be included as part of the Project and recommended that Tsuut'ina Nation formulate a "compliance verification model" to mitigate and monitor the region over the life-cycle of the Project. This would include, but not be limited to, monitoring for air quality, emissions, medicinal plants, wildlife corridors, and habitat, and would work towards a sustainable future for Tsuut'ina Nation.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>that fugitive dust emissions would not have significant adverse effects on ambient air quality.</p> <p>To some extent, natural mitigation with respect to future potential fugitive dust emissions has already occurred. The 2013 flood removed an appreciable portion of fine sediment (e.g., clay and fine silt) from the upstream Elbow River drainage basin. The remaining surficial materials in the stream bed and on the banks of the Elbow River and its tributaries that may be prone to mobilization during a future flood would comprise mostly larger material (e.g., sand). Hence, most of the sediment deposited in the reservoir during future floods would be dominated by sand, not fine silt. The sand is less prone to result in fugitive dust during dry windy meteorological conditions.</p> <p>A primary mitigation for wind erosion in the reservoir would be the re-establishment of vegetation cover (e.g., native grasses) after reservoir draining. Natural revegetation success, however, is not assured, given initial high moisture contents and reduced energy input in the autumn. Should wind erosion occur and natural revegetation prove to be ineffective, a tackifier may be applied where required. Tackifiers are a sprayable erosion control product that bonds with the soil surface and creates a porous and absorbent erosion resistant blanket that can last for up to 12 months.</p>			
75	August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Air quality	Requested on reserve air quality assessment.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
76	May 14-15, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation. September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation	Precipitation Climate change	Tsuut'ina Nation inquired whether precipitation, specifically fog, has been considered in Project planning, noting that climate change has resulted in a lot of fog, ice, wind, heat, and other weather patterns. Concerned with the impact climate change may have.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
77	October 28, 2016 Meeting with the Tsuut'ina Nation Consultation Office, Alberta Transportation,	Monitoring	The Tsuut'ina Nation have requested that they be allowed to have their Field Monitors on the SR1 site throughout the construction to ensure that any	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible monitoring opportunities with the Tsuut'ina Nation.	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested information on the process that will occur in the event that a rock cairn, burial, or other significant find is found. Alberta Transportation noted that a protocol regarding site encounters should be established. Tsuut'ina Nation noted that this could potentially	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>Stantec, and DEMA Land Services</p> <p>August 8, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p> <p>September 21, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation</p>		<p>heritage sites that may be impacted would be respected.</p> <p>Capacity for monitoring for the life cycle of the Project.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation would like to see monitoring before, during, and after construction.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on September 21, 2018 and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed that they would like to build a long term monitoring plan with Tsuut'ina Nation, and asked for them to think about how they would like to be involved.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, historical resources and possible mitigation measures, including following ACT's requirements, monitoring opportunities, using TUS report information, and the potential for more excavation per ACT's direction, were discussed. Monitoring during construction and post-flood was presented as a possible mitigation measure.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. Alberta Transportation will participate in discussions regarding possible monitoring opportunities. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	form part of a monitoring plan. Tsuut'ina Nation recommended that a monitoring plan be established with ACT.		
78	<p>April 3, 2018</p> <p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p>	<p>Monitors Vegetation</p> <p>Community-based water monitoring</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: Tsuut'ina is strongly against project proceeding. If it does, Tsuut'ina requires, at minimum: Tsuut'ina monitors on-site during pre-construction and construction phases; for every tree removed, same type of tree should be replanted by First Nations close to where it was removed; and support for Tsuut'ina to develop their own community-based water monitoring program.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation is willing to discuss possible monitoring opportunities with the Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 21, 2018 and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed that they would like to build a long term monitoring plan with Tsuut'ina Nation, and asked for them to think about how they would like to be involved.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, monitoring during construction and post-flood was presented as a possible mitigation measure for historical resources.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA. To maintain the integrity of permanent structures, trees will not be permitted to grow on the diversion system, the diversion channel, or the dam structure. Temporary work spaces will be reclaimed incorporating input on native species to be used for reclamation from Tsuut'ina Nation and other Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation will discuss possible monitoring opportunities with Tsuut'ina Nation and other Indigenous groups. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
79	<p>May 14-15, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta</p>	<p>Climate change</p> <p>Monitoring</p> <p>Cumulative effects</p>	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation recommended that a work plan be established to consider resource revenue sharing, cumulative effects, climate change, construction monitoring, and long-term</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation expressed their willingness to discuss monitoring, and to work together on a plan to move forward.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 21, 2018 and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed that they would like to build a long term monitoring plan with Tsuut'ina Nation, and asked for them to think about how they would like to be involved.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.		monitoring (for the life of the Project).	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . Alberta Transportation will participate in discussions regarding possible monitoring opportunities. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.			
80	September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation	Post-flood clean-up	Tsuut'ina Nation would like to be involved in managing and co-managing the post-flood clean-up.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
81	<p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks August 23, 2017</p> <p>Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation leadership.</p>	Economic Impacts Impacts to Reserve	<p>Concern about project impacts to Tsuut'ina economic interests at Redwood Meadows such as the Golf and Country Club in the NW section of the Reserve.</p> <p>Concerns about the economic losses if flood waters back up onto the Reserve.</p> <p>Concerns the SR1 may impact land development on the Reserve.</p> <p>Concerns about flood issues Tsuut'ina has experienced in the past at Redwood Meadows.</p>	<p>In a letter dated June 6, 2017 from Minister Brian Mason, Minister Mason proposed creating a small working committee of technical representatives from the Government of Alberta and Tsuut'ina Nation for the purpose of reviewing and identifying any additional flood protection requirements for Redwood Meadows. No response has been received from Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Project will have no effects on the Redwood Meadows Golf and Country Club (the "Club").</p> <p>The Club is outside of the Project development area and upstream of the Project components. During a flood event, it is expected that some water will "back-up" upstream of the diversion structure. Modeling studies have shown that the "back-up" of water would not reach the Tsuut'ina Reserve upstream or the Redwood Meadows Golf and Country Club located on the reserve. At its closest point the back-up water would be approximately 1,100m from the Reserve. In the event the diversion structure does not operate properly, and water continually backs up behind the structure, the auxiliary spillway and floodplain berm have been designed with a low point that will allow flood water to pass over the berm and continue downstream, therefore preventing back up flooding.</p> <p>A flood mitigation project for Bragg Creek is being funded by Alberta Government through Rocky View County. Alberta Transportation is also engaged with Tsuut'ina regarding flood mitigation for Redwood Meadows. Alberta Transportation has contacted Tsuut'ina and a technical committee has been formed to assess flood mitigation options. Alberta Transportation is awaiting a response from Tsuut'ina in order to get the Redwood Meadows flood protection project planning underway.</p> <p>At the meeting held on May 15, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided Tsuut'ina Nation with copies of the June 6, 2017 letter from Minister Brian Mason to Chief Lee Crowchild.</p> <p>On July 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation funded Tsuut'ina Nation to conduct an assessment of flood mitigation options for Redwood Meadows. Tsuut'ina Nation and Alberta Transportation met on</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated they did not agree with this response in full, stating that engagement with Tsuut'ina Nation to discuss planning and understanding the potential environmental effects to Redwood Meadows is still ongoing.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation also reiterated the importance of looking at SR1 cumulatively with the other flood mitigation projects in the area.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>September 21, 2018 to discuss Aquatic Resource Management Ltd.'s report on flood mitigation for Redwood Meadows.</p> <p>At the meeting held on February 21, 2019, Alberta Transportation brought Wim Veldman to present his review of Aquatic Resource Management Ltd.'s proposal for flood protection at Redwood Meadows. Alberta Transportation committed to meeting again once Tsuut'ina Nation and their consultants had a chance to review the information.</p>			
82	<p>April 3, 2018</p> <p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p>	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation economic opportunities</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: Members of Tsuut'ina should be field crew for all archaeological and other field work.</p>	<p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for monitoring and employment opportunities. Alberta Transportation will commit to a requirement for contractors to employ qualified Indigenous field assistants on archaeological fieldwork. Alberta Transportation will discuss opportunities for qualified Indigenous field assistants to participate on other project-related fieldwork as practical. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>
83	<p>April 21, 2016</p> <p>Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services</p>	<p>Access to lands</p>	<p>Confirmation of SR1 Access.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on April 21, 2016, it was explained that access agreements were signed with most SR1 landowners.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation committed to continue sharing information and providing access to the public and private lands where mutual access agreements had been negotiated.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation spent 21 field days on SR1 lands in 2016/2017.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation confirmed they had spent 21 days on the site.</p>	<p>Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
84	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	<p>Land access</p> <p>Traditional uses</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment must consider how the Project may impact Tsuut'ina's ability to access the lands and waters used for traditional activities.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: For the purposes of the EIA, effects on potential or established Aboriginal or Treaty rights are addressed through the assessment of the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. By acknowledging a link between practice-based rights and current use, the assessment accepts that adverse residual effects on the availability of traditional resources for current use, on access to traditional resources or areas for current use, or on sites or areas for current use will have a consequent effect on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise potential or established Aboriginal and Treaty rights. In addition, a conservative assumption was made that Indigenous groups had access to the PDA to practice traditional use activities notwithstanding access to these private lands is limited.</p> <p>At the meetings held on September 21, 2018 and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed future land use planning and asked Tsuut'ina Nation to think about how they would like to see the lands used.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>for hunting, fishing, and traditional use, including: development of a land use plan; and mitigation measures for wildlife and fish. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 6, 2018, Alberta Transportation presented on their proposed plan for a land use plan that would include: access for traditional use, hunting, and harvesting; management during/after a flood; and ongoing monitoring programs.</p>			
85	September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation	Land use planning	Tsuut'ina Nation would like to see a land use plan and heritage resource plan.	<p>At the meetings held on September 21, 2018 and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed future land use planning and asked Tsuut'ina Nation to think about how they would like to see the lands used once the project is built.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. Alberta Transportation committed to the development of a land use plan. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p> <p>At the meeting held on December 6, 2018, Alberta Transportation presented on their proposed plan for a land use plan that would include: access for traditional use, hunting, and harvesting; management during/after a flood; and ongoing monitoring programs.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
86	May 14-15, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.	Riparian areas Access	Tsuut'ina Nation asked whether the riparian area adjacent to the proposed Project will be accessible and if the concrete infrastructure will block it.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
87	August 31, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation and Tsuut'ina	Engagement	Tsuut'ina presented the option of having an SR1 Community Information Session to be organized and held on the Tsuut'ina Reserve.	<p>At the meeting held on August 31, 2017, Alberta Transportation committed to working with Tsuut'ina Nation to facilitate a community engagement session on the SR1 Project.</p> <p>Community workshops to discuss the TLRU sections of the EIA (Volumes 3A and 3B) were held March 1, 5, 6, and 7, 2018 on the Tsuut'ina reserve.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
88	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation leadership.	Engagement	<p>Tsuut'ina should have been part of the project selection process and should have been part of the technical EIA work completed by Stantec on behalf of Alberta Transportation.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina should be a decision maker and want the SR1</p>	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Immediately following the 2013 flood, the Government of Alberta through Alberta Transportation hired the engineering company, AMEC, to prepare a report on options to mitigate damage due to flooding on the Elbow River including the SR1 and the Maclean Creek option. The report was completed in early 2014 and recommended the SR1 flood mitigation option. In 2015, Alberta	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation reiterated the importance of getting consent from First Nations.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation stated that the current EIA does not capture upstream mitigation planning (including Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows mitigation) and therefore the EIA does not take a</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>project to require Tsuut'ina's "Consent" as part of the current process.</p>	<p>Transportation hired Deltares to review Amec's report. The Deltares review agreed with Amec's report recommendation. Based on these report recommendations, Alberta Transportation chose to proceed with the SR1. Alberta Transportation has provided the Amec and Deltares reports with the Tsuut'ina Nation as part of the current ongoing engagement process. A detailed assessment as to why SR1 was chosen is also provided in the EIA.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided funding to Tsuut'ina for a traditional use study. To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 21 site visits by Tsuut'ina within the Project Development Area (PDA) over the period between the fall of 2016 to the late summer of 2017. A TUS study was not received in time to be incorporated in the EIA submitted in October 2017. A draft TUS has now been received however Tsuut'ina's permission to include the information from it in the revised EIA re-submission has not been received.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent the link to the October 2017 EIS to Tsuut'ina on November 3, 2017. On December 5, 2017. Alberta Transportation requested feedback on the TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated that in 2013 when the province was exploring flood mitigation, they had tried two times to contact Tsuut'ina Nation to get feedback on the effects of the 2013 flood to Tsuut'ina. Alberta Transportation noted that funding has been provided to complete the Bragg Creek mitigation and Government of Alberta is prepared to engage with Tsuut'ina Nation regarding mitigation options for flood protection at Redwood Meadows.</p> <p>On July 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation funded Tsuut'ina Nation to conduct an assessment of mitigation options for flood protection at Redwood Meadows. Tsuut'ina Nation and Alberta Transportation met on September 21, 2018 to discuss Aquatic Resource Management Ltd.'s report on flood mitigation for Redwood Meadows.</p>	<p>comprehensive view of the Project in order to understand potential cumulative effects.</p>		
89	<p>May 18, 2017 Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation July 19, 2017 Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p>	<p>Engagement</p>	<p>Concerned that Alberta Transportation have not engaged Tsuut'ina on the additional work set forth in the Appendix A of the May 30, 2016, letter and is now moving forward with the EIS submission.</p> <p>Requests engagement with Tsuut'ina on the collection of the information identified in Appendix A (of the May 30, 2016 letter) and other</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation has been engaged with Tsuut'ina Nation since 2014 to understand how the Project potentially impacts rights, interests and traditional uses.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation has provided funding to Tsuut'ina for a traditional use study. To facilitate the traditional use studies, Alberta Transportation arranged and facilitated 21 site visits by Tsuut'ina within the Project Development Area (PDA) over the period between the fall of 2016 to the late summer of 2017. A TUS study was not received in time to be incorporated in the EIA submitted in October 2017. A draft TUS has now been received however Tsuut'ina's permission to include the</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation stated that the process is moving quickly, and the Nation does not want to rush a decision. Tsuut'ina Nation added that safety and socioeconomic certainty are important factors in making a decision.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested information regarding specific mitigation planning and recommended that Alberta Transportation participate in developing a Project-specific work plan.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>	<p>Ongoing: Working with First Nation</p>

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>information needed to understand the SR1 impacts.</p> <p>Recommend engagement with Tsuut'ina to prepare a consultation work plan to guide the remainder of the review process for the Project.</p> <p>Concerned by the lack of engagement on the project.</p>	<p>information from it in the revised EIA re-submission has not been received.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation sent the link to the October 2017 EIS to Tsuut'ina on November 3, 2017. On December 5, 2017, Alberta Transportation requested feedback on the TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further indigenous engagement activities.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation provided Tsuut'ina Nation with the revised draft TLRU sections for review and comment under correspondence dated February 6, 2018. Alberta Transportation also offered a workshop with the goal of better understanding potential impacts of the Project to Tsuut'ina Nations and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation arranged 4-day workshop with Tsuut'ina on March 1, 5, 6 and 7, 2018. The workshop was facilitated by CEAA with the goal of better understanding potential impacts to Tsuut'ina from the Project and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date. Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU section has not been updated to include information discussed.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated they are willing to continue to meet and discuss mitigation for project impacts with Indigenous groups.</p>			
90	<p>May 14-15, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.</p> <p>October 11, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation</p>	Regulatory process	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concerns that late June is the beginning of the ceremony season, but the Project review and Information Request (IR) process will be occurring at the same time. Tsuut'ina Nation wants the opportunity to continue to participate meaningfully in the Project.</p> <p>Involvement of Tsuut'ina Nation in the regulatory/IR process.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation stated they wanted to continue to work with Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation indicated they were willing to discuss CEAA IRs of concern with Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>Under cover dated January 28, 2019, Alberta Transportation requested that Tsuut'ina Nation provide its views and perspectives on its Aboriginal and Treaty rights, cultural and experiential values, and country foods. The letter listed four specific topics that Alberta Transportation was requesting input on to help answer Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) IR2-01, IR2-02, and IR2-08. The specific information requests were attached as Appendix A. A deadline of February 28, 2019 was given for written feedback to be included in the IR responses. Feedback received after the deadline will be incorporated into regulatory submissions and project planning, as appropriate.</p>	<p>In a letter dated February 28, 2019, Tsuut'ina Nation responded to Alberta Transportation's January 28, 2019. Alberta Transportation received the CEAA IRs over five months prior to the date of the January 28, 2019 letter, but only provided Tsuut'ina Nation with four weeks to respond. Please explain the timing behind Alberta Transportation's request.</p> <p>The timing of Alberta Transportation's request is problematic given that the environmental assessment for the Project is not yet complete. Tsuut'ina has identified a number of information gaps in the environmental assessment, including with respect to issues relating to groundwater, surface water, vegetation and wetlands, wildlife, archaeological sites, and cumulative effects. This information is needed to understand how the Project will impact Tsuut'ina's Aboriginal and treaty rights and what mitigation or</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
					<p>accommodation measures will be required to mitigate potential impacts.</p> <p>In Tsuut'ina Nation's view, it is not a robust or respectful approach to the assessment of potential impacts to Tsuut'ina's Aboriginal and Treaty rights from the Project to expect that impacts can be identified and mitigated in the absence of the information that Tsuut'ina has identified as necessary and is still being collected.</p> <p>Should Alberta Transportation intend to submit its responses to the IRs without waiting for the outstanding information to be collected and assessed, Tsuut'ina requests the opportunity to review the draft IR responses before they are submitted to CEAA so that they can provide their input.</p>		
91	<p>May 18, 2017 Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation July 19, 2017 Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p>	Environmental Impact Statement	<p>An opportunity for Tsuut'ina to review the draft EIS before it is submitted to the Agency.</p> <p>Concerns when Tsuut'ina will be able to review the Environmental assessments being completed for SR1.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Alberta Transportation sent the link to the October 2017 EIS to Tsuut'ina on November 3, 2017. On December 5, 2017 Alberta Transportation requested feedback on the TLRU sections (Volumes 3A and 3B).</p> <p>Project timelines for resubmission of the EIA were extended by 60 days in order to undertake further indigenous engagement activities.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation provided Tsuut'ina Nation with the revised draft TLRU sections for review and comment under correspondence dated February 6, 2018. Alberta Transportation also offered a workshop with the goal of better understanding potential impacts of the Project to Tsuut'ina Nations and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation arranged 4-day workshop with Tsuut'ina on March 1, 5, 6 and 7, 2018. The workshop was facilitated by CEAA with the goal of better understanding potential impacts to Tsuut'ina from the Project and to provide responses to the concerns raised to date. Verification of the meeting minutes from the workshops was not received prior to March 16, 2018 and therefore the TLRU section has not been updated to include information discussed.</p> <p>Relevant information, concerns and recommendations received after the EIA has been filed in March 2018 will be used for project planning and implementation purposes, where applicable.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained they did not share the full EIA with anyone prior to submission as per the regulation process. Alberta Transportation also indicated they had offered workshops in 2016 but the offer was not acted on by Tsuut'ina Nation.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation stated Alberta Transportation should have engaged with them earlier. Now they are under CEAA's tight timelines.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
92	<p>May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p> <p>August 31, 2017</p> <p>Meeting between Alberta Transportation and Tsuut'ina</p>	Hydrology	<p>An opportunity for Tsuut'ina to review the draft hydrology report before it is submitted to the agency.</p> <p>Concerned that while Alberta Environment are preparing a hydrology study on SR1, there has not been sufficient engagement with Tsuut'ina to know if this study covers the areas or issues of most concern.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina requested a copy of the Breach Analysis Report and Hydrology Study.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The following reports were sent by registered mail to Chief Crowchild and Tsuut'ina's Consultation Office on February 9, 2018.</p> <p>Hydrology - Springbank Off-Stream Storage Project Hydrology Flood Frequency Analysis – Report on Methods and Results (March 22, 2017)</p> <p>Dam Breach Analysis – Breach Analysis and Inundation Mapping – Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir (SR1) (March 6, 2017)</p> <p>EIA - Volume 3B, Section 5.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Hydrogeology (November 2017)</p> <p>EIA - Appendix I Hydrogeology – Hydrogeology Baseline Technical Data Report (November 2017)</p> <p>An email with a link to the draft Hydrology Report was also provided on February 9, 2018.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained they did not share the full EIA with anyone prior to submission as per the regulation process.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation questioned the boundary of the RAA.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation requested that wetlands be considered within the hydrology assessment.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation requested certainty that when the water backs up during a flood event it will not flood Redwood Meadows and turn it into a wetland, and that if springs are covered by back water this will not affect drinking water.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation stated that because a request for funding to conduct a hydrology study was not funded early in the Project, Tsuut'ina Nation is now having to catch up (with the support of PGL Environmental Consultants) to understand the potential effects on hydrology from the Project.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation stated that currently it is not understood what will happen between Bragg Creek and the proposed SR1 project in the event of a flood, including effects on Tsuut'ina Nation reserve lands and Redwood Meadows.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation questioned why the 2013 flood was chosen as the design flood.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
93	<p>August 31, 2017</p> <p>Meeting between Alberta Transportation and Tsuut'ina</p>	Funding	It is a concern that the Tsuut'ina budget for a hydrology study had not been approved.	<p>At the meeting held on August 31, 2017, Alberta Transportation responded that the hydrology information gathered during the SR1 technical studies could be shared with Tsuut'ina Nation and if needed a meeting to discuss the hydrology could be arranged.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: A Hydrology report has been prepared for the EIA submission that has gathered all baseline information and assesses the potential impacts and effects of the Project.</p> <p>On July 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation funded Tsuut'ina Nation to conduct an assessment of flood mitigation options for Redwood Meadows. Tsuut'ina Nation and Alberta Transportation met on September 21, 2018 to discuss Aquatic Resource Management Ltd.'s report on flood mitigation for Redwood Meadows.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation stated that because a request for funding to conduct a hydrology study was not funded early in the Project, Tsuut'ina Nation is now having to catch up (with the support of PGL Environmental Consultants) to understand the potential effects on hydrology from the Project.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
94	<p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks</p>	Funding	Concerns that Tsuut'ina's ability to review the environment assessment is extremely limited without capacity funding.	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: Funding is available to Indigenous groups through CEAA to review the EIA and participate in the regulatory review process.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation responded that if Tsuut'ina Nation felt the review of the EIA was not</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation questioned the adequacy of CEAA funding, noting that there is ongoing logistics, planning, coordinating, technical meetings, and reporting that is not always funded. Tsuut'ina Nation added that nobody funds the EIA completeness review.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				adequate, to let Alberta Transportation know what further activities they would like to undertake so they can take it to management.			
95	<p>May 14-15, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.</p> <p>August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec</p> <p>September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation</p> <p>October 11, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation</p>	<p>Safety</p> <p>Emergency response</p> <p>Disaster planning</p>	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concerns about safety and requested a communication plan to ensure that Nations and reserves receive warning about potential floods.</p> <p>Concerns that the emergency response plan would be developed after Project approvals, and Tsuut'ina Nation would not be able to assess the plan.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation would like to see disaster planning.</p> <p>Emergency response process. Tsuut'ina Nation would like there to be an emergency response planning exercise. When a flood hits, both Alberta Transportation and Tsuut'ina Nation need to understand the process so people are prepared.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation explained that Rocky View County would have an emergency notification plan that would notify everyone; they would have a list of people to contact.</p> <p>At the meeting held on August 8, 2018, Alberta Transportation committed to trying to expediate the process of developing emergency response plans and bringing the information back to Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for accidents and malfunctions, including dam failure, such as, in the event of failure or breach of dam, Alberta Emergency Management Agency and Calgary Emergency Management Agency will enact emergency response procedures and disaster recovery programs. Should a failure or breach of the auxiliary spillway occur, emergency response procedures will be implemented to address public safety. Alberta Transportation also committed to including dam safety and emergency response planning to the agenda for a future meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
96	<p>April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p> <p>May 14-15, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.</p> <p>May 14, 2018</p>	<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Impact to reserve</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>Hydrology</p>	<p>Concerned that the Project will compound cumulative effects from ongoing development, including impacts to water flow through the reserve, plant and animal loss, barriers to access, etc.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concern that the current EIA dismisses any interaction with the upstream mitigation planning, i.e., Redwood Meadows and Bragg Creek. The project is not being looked at holistically or considering cumulative effects.</p> <p>Integrated effects assessment that included Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows mitigation was not included.</p>	<p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided Tsuut'ina Nation with copies of the June 6, 2017 letter from Minister Brian Mason to Chief Lee Crowchild that suggested a working group be formed to discuss mitigation at Redwood Meadows. Alberta Transportation explained the province is looking at flood mitigation at Bragg Creek, and projects will not be designed to wipe each other out.</p> <p>On July 21, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided funding for Tsuut'ina Nation to conduct an assessment of flood mitigation options for Redwood Meadows.</p> <p>In an email on August 22, 2018, Alberta Transportation proposed a meeting to discuss SR1 as well as Tsuut'ina Nation's additional work that was funded July 21, 2018. This was followed up again in email on August 27, 2018 and phone conversations on August 29, 2018. The meetings proposed would include SR1, as well as discussing the results of Tsuut'ina Nation's assessment of flood mitigation options for Redwood Meadows.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation and Alberta Transportation met on September 21, 2018 to discuss Aquatic Resource Management Ltd.'s report on flood protection for Redwood Meadows.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p><i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018</p> <p>July 12, 2018</p> <p>Letter dated July 12, 2018 from Chief Lee Crowchild and Councillor Vincent Crowchild to Minister Brian Mason</p> <p>December 6, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.</p> <p>February 21, 2019</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation and Alberta Transportation</p> <p>February 28, 2019</p> <p>Letter from Tanis Onespot to Alberta Transportation</p>		<p>Concerns expressed regarding flood mitigation in and around the Tsuut'ina Reserve, including the Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir program, and how none will protect their reserve from flooding and could increase their vulnerability.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concerns with how SR1 will interact with other flood mitigation projects in the area.</p> <p>Scope of EIA must be expanded to include potential effects from all works recommended in the Deltares report.</p> <p>Safety and security of Tsuut'ina Nation in terms of flood protection.</p> <p>Tsuut'ina Nation voiced concerns regarding the cumulative effects of multiple flood mitigation projects around their lands.</p> <p>The project, when combined with the project proposed for the Bragg Creek area, may increase the risk of flooding on their reserve.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation has committed to continue discussions on flood protection for Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for cumulative effects. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p> <p>At the morning meeting held on February 21, 2019, Alberta Transportation detailed the additional work that has been done with the hydrogeological model. Results of the updated modelling will be provided to Tsuut'ina Nation.</p> <p>At the afternoon meeting held on February 21, 2019, Wim Veldman presented on to present his review of Aquatic Resource Management Ltd.'s proposal for flood protection at Redwood Meadows.</p>			
97	<p>November 13, 2014</p> <p>Initial SR1 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services</p> <p>May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p>	<p>Impacts to Reserve</p> <p>Dam operation</p>	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation were concerned that the failure of any dam, particularly MC1, and also SR1, would impact Tsuut'ina first.</p> <p>Concerned any failure of the SR1 dam or spillway during a flood could have catastrophic consequences for Tsuut'ina.</p> <p>Concerns that dam and diversion will not act as intended - what if intake is blocked and floods? What if the dam fails? What assurances are there the Project will function as intended?</p>	<p>Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Tsuut'ina Nation will be addressed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>At meetings held on April 21, 2016 and August 23, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that the SR1 project was the main focus of the Government of Alberta and that the MC1 option would not be moving forward.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: SR1 dam and structures will comply fully with the Canadian Dam Association guidelines and statistically a dam breach is unlikely. However, an emergency preparedness plan will be prepared, and advanced warning would be given in the event of a failure. Instrumentation will be installed and will provide advanced warning if failure issues are detected. The emergency spillway will prevent flood waters from overtopping the dam.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	<p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks April 3, 2018</p> <p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p>		<p>RECOMMENDATION: Require a special consultation session related to possibility of dam failure.</p>	<p>On May 14-15, 2018, August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Tsuut'ina Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses – Tsuut'ina Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation discussed potential accidents and malfunctions, including dam breaches.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for accidents and malfunctions, including dam failure, such as, in the event of failure or breach of dam, Alberta Emergency Management Agency and Calgary Emergency Management Agency will enact emergency response procedures and disaster recovery programs. Alberta Transportation also committed to including dam safety and emergency response planning to the agenda for a future meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
98	<p>May 18, 2017</p> <p>Letter by Violet Meguinis, Acting Consultation Director Tsuut'ina to the Honorable Brian Mason, Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation July 19, 2017</p> <p>Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild to Alberta Environment and Parks November 1, 2017</p> <p>Technical overview for the EIA with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec.</p>	Impact to Reserve	<p>Concerned that SR1 could increase the risk of Tsuut'ina lands being flooded.</p> <p>Concerned that the SR1 Project would not prevent flooding on Tsuut'ina Reserve lands or traditional territory.</p> <p>Concerned about potential flooding of Tsuut'ina land caused by the floodplain berm.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on November 1, 2017, Stantec explained that the groundwater sampling and modeling show that the Elbow River is a hydrologic divide and the effects of operating the Springbank Off-stream Reservoir are contained to the Project Development Area (PDA) and do not extend south of the Elbow River.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Tsuut'ina reserve lands have been included in the EIA.</p> <p>The potential effects of the Project have been assessed using three geographic areas. The Project Development Area (PDA), the Local Assessment Area (LAA) and the Regional Assessment Area (RAA).</p> <p>The PDA represents the project footprint i.e., immediate area of physical disturbance and construction activities (approximately 1440 ha). The PDA located on private land, north of the Elbow River, and this area is the same for all the valued components (VCs). The LAA is an area larger than the PDA and is considered to be the area where Project effects would be reasonably expected to occur and where effects can be predicted or measured with a reasonable degree of accuracy. The RAA is an area larger than the LAA and is an area within which Project effects may interact or accumulate with the effects of other projects or activities. The size of the LAA and RAA varies depending on the VC being assessed. In many cases the assessment areas include the Tsuut'ina Reserve.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>In addition to the assessment of VCs the EIA document also contains an assessment of the potential Project effects on Federal Lands, including the Tsuut'ina Reserve (Volume 3A and 3B, Chapter 18).</p> <p>No back up of water onto Tsuut'ina Reserve is expected, including debris and contamination.</p> <p>The Project will provide flood protection for communities and lands downstream of the diversion structure, including the northeastern part of the Tsuut'ina Reserve that is located downstream of the diversion structure. During a flood event, it is expected that some water will "back-up" upstream of the diversion structure. However, modeling studies have shown that the "back-up" of water would not reach the Tsuut'ina Reserve upstream even in a 2013 design flood event. At its closest point the back-up water would be approximately 1,130 m from the Reserve Volume 3A, Section 18, Figure 18-3.</p> <p>In the event the diversion structure does not operate properly, and water continually backs up behind the structure, the auxiliary spillway and floodplain berm have been designed with a low point that will allow flood water to pass over the berm and continue downstream, thereby preventing back up flooding.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for accidents and malfunctions, including dam failure. Alberta Transportation also committed to including dam safety and emergency response planning to the agenda for a future meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
99	August 23, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation leadership.	Flooding	Asked what would happen if the gates were left up during a flood and water was allowed to continue to enter the reservoir.	At the meeting on August 23, 2017, Stantec explained the purpose of the emergency spillway on the design, that if such an event occurred, which was unlikely, the spillway would return water to the Elbow River and Stantec stated the SR1 was designed so that the water level behind the dam, in a flood event, would pass out the same spillway and would never exceed 3 metres from the top of the SR1 dam.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
100	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project Environmental Impact Assessment Dam Safety Information Deficiency Analysis</i> by Robert J. Huzjak, dated June 14, 2018	Dam safety	<p>Adequate information is not available for a regulatory authority or an independent engineer to evaluate the feasibility of the concepts and the safety of the dam and other project components.</p> <p>Adequate information was not provided to evaluate the technical, safety, and performance differences and risks between the MC1 and SR1 alternatives.</p>	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for accidents and malfunctions, including dam failure. Alberta Transportation also committed to including dam safety and emergency response planning to the agenda for a future meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation. Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA. Alberta Transportation committed to providing its response to CEAA IR3-45 (regarding additional information for alternative projects) to Tsuut'ina Nation once completed and, if requested, discussing the response. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
			<p>Potential failure modes for the dam and other facilities do not appear to have been identified and therefore, have not been addressed in development of the design concept.</p> <p>The design includes a gated outlet that enables, or could result in, the dam storing waste water for prolonged periods of time. It does not appear that the design has adequately considered this condition, which could impact the safety of the dam.</p>				
101	<p>May 14-15, 2018</p> <p>Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec to discuss Tsuut'ina Nation's specific concerns and Alberta Transportation's responses and proposed mitigation.</p>	Security	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation noted that with a proposed Bragg Creek emergency exit access road, even though it's being managed through Rocky View Country, road changes need to be considered cumulatively and cohesively. It will open a corridor and have a regional impact and causes security concerns.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
102	<p>November 13, 2014</p> <p>Initial SR1 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services</p> <p>April 21, 2016</p> <p>Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services</p>	Road closures	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation concerned that the SR1 Project (in a flood situation) could cause road closures that would impact tourists.</p> <p>Concerns expressed on the impact that SR1 would have on access routes in the SR1 Project.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on November 13, 2014, Alberta Transportation responded that roads were being looked at to keep open, with no permanent road closures planned.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: During construction, there will be no road closures with the exception of Range Road 41 which currently dead-ends south of Springbank Road, it will be permanently closed. To accommodate construction of bridges over the diversion channel on TWP Road 242 and Hwy 22, traffic will be detoured to bypass construction activities.</p> <p>Springbank road will be closed temporarily during a flood event that inundates the road. Local traffic will be detoured to access Hwy 1 to the north to bypass the temporary closure.</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation indicated that the response in Table 7-3 responds to the concern.	Proponent response satisfactory to First Nation.	No further action required.
103	<p>May 30, 2016</p> <p>Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p>	Impacts to Reserve	<p>Potential impacts to the Reserve from the realignment of Highway 22 which abuts the Reserve.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Tsuut'ina Reserve will not be impacted by the proposed realignment of Highway 22.</p> <p>The location of the outlet works, and realignment of Highway 22 are described in the Project Description (Volume 1 of the EIA).</p>	At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation noted that with a proposed Bragg Creek emergency exit access road, even though it will be managed through Rocky View County, road changes need to be considered cumulatively and cohesively.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
104	<p>November 13, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services</p> <p>May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <p>August 23, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation leadership.</p>	Pipelines	<p>Tsuut'ina Nation are concerned what would happen to the oil pipelines that traverse the SR1 project.</p> <p>Accidents or malfunctions resulting from construction activities. The Project would intersect with several operating or inactive buried pipelines in the Project area, some of which also cross our reserve. These pipelines carry a variety of substances including high pressure and low-pressure product, natural gas and sour gas.</p> <p>Inquired about pipelines that cross the SR1 and what would happen to them.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on November 13, 2014, Alberta Transportation responded that any pipelines impacted by the SR1 project would probably be relocated, but specific information was not available at this time.</p> <p>At the August 23, 2017 meeting, Stantec responded that impacted pipelines would be relocated.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The procedures for dealing with overhead and buried utilities located within constructions zones is highly regulated. All regulatory requirements will be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>Oil and gas pipelines operated by four companies (TransCanada Pipelines Ltd., Pengrowth Energy Corp., Veresen Inc., and Plains Midstream Canada) are located within the diversion channel, dam, and reservoir areas.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation are currently in contact with these utility owners and crossing agreements will be developed. Buried pipeline and overhead utilities will be relocated, moved or lowered as required. Prior to any soil disturbance, utility locate sweeps will be done and buried lines and pipelines will be flagged and marked. Pipeline crossings will be designed and maintained as required by the utility owners and in strict compliance with regulations. Daily hazard assessments will be conducted before work is undertaken in the vicinity of utilities. In the event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address pipeline emergency response. The implementation preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>In the unlikely event of damage to existing pipelines, project personnel would contact the pipeline company's emergency contacts to address and coordinate the emergency response. The implementation of preventative measures and of daily hazard assessments will greatly reduce the risk of accidental contact with utilities.</p> <p>On May 14-15, 2018, August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Tsuut'ina Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i>.</p> <p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation described that the pipelines within the Project area would be retrofitted or relocated as required. It will be the responsibility of the pipeline operators to clean up any spills. Alberta Transportation confirmed only pipelines within the Project area would be moved, not pipelines on Tsuut'ina lands. Alberta Transportation also discussed accidents and malfunctions, and described that the pipelines within the Project area would be retrofitted or relocated as required. It will be the responsibility of the pipeline operators to clean up any spills. Alberta Transportation</p>	<p>At the meeting held on October 11, 2018 Tsuut'ina Nation voiced concerns about pipelines that run through their lands and if work had to be done on those.</p>	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				confirmed only pipelines within the Project area would be moved, not pipelines on Tsuut'ina lands.			
105	September 21, 2018 Letter from Chief Lee Crowchild, Councillor Vincent Crowchild, and Councillor Lyle Dodginghorse	Project interactions Cumulative effects	Tsuut'ina Nation expressed concerns that the Bragg Creek Project was not designated for environmental assessment under CEAA 2012, and expressed concerns that the potential interaction between the Bragg Creek Project and SR1 would not be studied. Tsuut'ina Nation proposed multiple studies that they would like to be done.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
106	May 30, 2016 Letter from Chief Roy Whitney to Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Visual impacts	Visual impacts to reserve lands as the Diversion Structure and the Storage Dam are likely to be visible from the reserve.	On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The diversion structure is located about 2000 metres from the northwestern boundary of the Tsuut'ina Reserve and it is not likely to be visible from the Tsuut'ina reserve lands. The easterly portion of the off-stream reservoir dam is located north of the Elbow River. The earth fill dam is approximately 27 metres tall at its highest point and it will be seeded to grass. It will blend into the existing contours and landscape. The dam at its highest point will be lower than the level of the surrounding high ridge immediately south of the Springbank road that currently dominates the local landscape. The dam may possibly be visible from Highway 8 south of the Elbow River, but it will most likely be hidden from view by the tall heavy tree growth along the river valley and its grass seeded side slopes.	At the meetings held on May-15, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation noted that linear access changes, sensory disturbance, and increased predators are all potential effects of the Project. Tsuut'ina Nation stated that there should be a plan to prepare wildlife for these landscape changes.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
107	September 21, 2018 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation	Construction	Concerned about the use of concrete for the diversion structure.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
108	August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Meeting attendance	Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) needs to be at the table.	At the meeting held on September 21, 2018, AEP was present for the morning discussion on flood mitigation for Redwood Meadows.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
109	October 17, 2018 Letter from Norine Saddleback to Kate McEwen, Aboriginal Consultation Office, sent via email to Alberta Transportation.	Meeting attendance	Tsuut'ina Nation was concerned that the ACO was not present at the October 11, 2018 meeting.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
110	April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.	Future development	Concern that once infrastructure is in place it will be easier to expand into new uses, and concerns that it will not remain a "dry" dam.	On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i> . In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for project design, including that the main objective of the project is to divert and retain a portion of Elbow River during a flood and release the water in a controlled manner after the threat of flood has subsided. The reservoir will not hold a permanent pool of water. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
111	August 8, 2018 Meeting between Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and Stantec	Project purpose	If it becomes a manmade lake, what will happen.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
112	May 14, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018.	Methodology Traditional Use	Scoping and valued component (VC) selection made without reference to traditional use information.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
113	May 14, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018. July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Methodology	Proponent has not provided clear statement as to why the design flood was selected, and how frequently this design flood is likely to be exceeded. Provide a flood frequency analysis incorporating effects of climate change, and determine if the 2013 flood is suitable as the design flood.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
114	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by	Hydrology	Provide a rationale for the LAA selected for the hydrology assessment.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
	PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.						
115	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	Hydrology	Cumulative effects for hydrology under construction and dry conditions should be assessed, including the proposed mitigation at Bragg Creek.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
116	May 14, 2018 <i>Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project EIS – Selected Section: Second Sufficiency Review</i> by PGL Environmental Group, dated April 16, 2018. Provided via email on May 14, 2018.	Flood frequency	Application does not provide 1:1000 year flood value.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
117	July 12, 2018 <i>Springbank Offstream Reservoir Project EIS Technical Review and Information Requests</i> by PGL Environmental Consultants, dated June 15, 2018.	TLRU	Clarify how TLRU information was incorporated into the analysis of effects.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
118	November 13, 2014 Initial SR1 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services	Environmental impacts	Tsuut'ina Nation are concerned about the environmental impacts to both McLean Creek and the Elbow River.	Possible impacts and mitigation measures related to concerns raised by the Tsuut'ina Nation will be addressed as part of the EIA. Alberta Transportation provided links to the EIA November 3, 2017, and to the March 2018 EIA on March 29, 2018. At meetings held on April 21, 2016 and August 23, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that the SR1 project was the main focus of the Government of Alberta and that the MC1 option would not be moving forward. On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The Diversion Structure will have minimal effect on the flow of the Elbow River or its course downstream when constructed. The three additional streams refer to small ephemeral streams that flow only part of the time. During construction of the diversion channel, the unnamed tributary (ID 1350) would be diverted into the diversion channel. Approximately 1,200 m of the tributary would be destroyed, with the lowest 300 m being fish habitat that would be lost. The loss of	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>the 300 m of habitat in the tributary could be offset by the enhancement or construction of side channel habitat on the Elbow River that could provide rearing habitat for salmonids and cover for small-bodied fish.</p> <p>The Project is designed to reduce the changes to the course of the river during extreme floods. The channel of the Elbow River experiences seasonal changes in flows. Such changes are greater during flood events. As discussed in Volume 3B, Section 6.4.4, the presence of the Project would decrease the amount of deposition and erosion of the channel bed during extreme flood events, compared to changes without the Project. Channel form and bedload (river bed particles) movement during extreme floods would remain the same with or without the Project. The Project is assessed as not resulting in significant changes to the Elbow River or local ecosystem. The diversion structure is designed to allow fish passage under all conditions.</p> <p>On May 14-15, 2018, August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Tsuut'ina Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses – Tsuut'ina Nation</i>.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA. Alberta Transportation committed to providing its response to CEAA IR3-45 (regarding additional information for alternative projects) to Tsuut'ina Nation once completed and, if requested, discussing the response. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
119	<p>April 3, 2018</p> <p><i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p>	Project selection	Believe that the selection of the Springbank Project shows a patterned, inherent bias against Tsuut'ina's community's interests in favour of more prosperous, non-Indigenous Calgarians and their subdivisions.	None at this time.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
120	<p>November 13, 2014</p> <p>Initial SR1 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services</p>	MC1 option	Tsuut'ina Nation inquired about the McLean Creek option (MC1) and why no one from Alberta had contacted Tsuut'ina on that option.	<p>At the meeting held on November 13, 2014, Alberta Transportation responded that the SR1 technical work would also include a review of MC1, but the SR1 project was the preferred flood mitigation project.</p> <p>At meetings held on April 21, 2016 and August 23, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that the SR1 project was the main focus of the Government of Alberta and that the MC1 option would not be moving forward.</p> <p>The March 2018 EIA reviewed alternatives, including MC1.</p> <p>At the meetings held on March 1 and 7, 2018, and May 14-15, 2018, it was reiterated that SR1 was the project moving forward, not MC1.</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				<p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA. Alberta Transportation committed to providing its response to CEAA IR3-45 (regarding additional information for alternative projects) to Tsuut'ina Nation once completed and, if requested, discussing the response. Alberta Transportation met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.</p>			
121	<p>August 23, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation leadership.</p>	MC1	<p>Critical that the MC1 location was not identified on the Stantec maps of the SR1 project area.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on August 23, 2017, the location of McLean Creek was pointed out, and it was stated that Alberta Transportation had hired other engineering firms to undertake work at McLean Creek in order to provide details on alternatives. Stantec emphasized that the Government of Alberta had made their decision that the SR-1 project was the one to move forward.</p> <p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The MC1 location has been mapped and these maps are included in the EIA submission.</p> <p>At the meetings held on May 14-15, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided large copies of the maps requested by Tsuut'ina Nation.</p>	<p>At the meeting held on May 14, 2018, Tsuut'ina Nation requested copies of large-scale maps showing MC1, Bragg Creek, SR1, Bow River, Tsuut'ina Nation and other components relevant to the Project.</p>	<p>Alberta Transportation updated the maps and provided copies to Tsuut'ina Nation</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>
122	<p>August 23, 2017 Meeting between Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and Tsuut'ina Nation leadership. April 3, 2018 <i>Draft Tsuut'ina Traditional Land Use Report for the Proposed Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project</i> prepared by Trailmark Systems Inc.</p>	McLean Creek option	<p>Tsuut'ina indicated that they live in an arid climate and water is very important, they saw MC1 as an opportunity to benefit from water that could be stored behind the MC1 dam.</p> <p>Believe that Maclean Creek is a better location for a diversion project, and believe third-party expert opinion supports this.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Reconsider Maclean Creek and other alternatives and consult.</p>	<p>On March 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation sent detailed responses to specific concerns raised to date by providing a copy of <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses - Tsuut'ina Nation</i> from the March 2018 EIA: The conceptual design for the MC1 option is a dry reservoir but maintains a small permanent pond of 3.5 million m³ of water to control sediment migration to the outlet structure. The MC1 option does not provide water storage.</p> <p>At meetings held on April 21, 2016 and August 23, 2017, Alberta Transportation indicated that the SR1 project was the main focus of the Government of Alberta and that the MC1 option would not be moving forward.</p> <p>The March 2018 EIA reviewed alternatives, including MC1.</p> <p>At the meetings held on March 1 and 7, 2018, and May 14-15, 2018, it was reiterated that SR1 was the project moving forward, not MC1.</p> <p>On May 14-15, 2018, August 8, 2018, September 21, 2018, and October 11, 2018, Alberta Transportation met with Tsuut'ina Nation to review their specific concerns and the responses and proposed mitigation measures in <i>Table 7-3 SR1 Project Specific Concerns and Responses – Tsuut'ina Nation</i>.</p> <p>On November 23, 2018, Alberta Transportation provided its report, <i>Response to Tsuut'ina Nation Traditional Land and Resource Use Information including Mitigation Table</i>. In the mitigation table, Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA for project design. Alberta Transportation provided the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA. Alberta Transportation committed to</p>	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation

	1. Document or Meeting Reference	2. Project Specific Aspect of the Concern Expressed	3. Specific Concern Expressed	4. Proponent Response on Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	5. First Nation/Metis Settlement response to Proponent's Effort to Avoid or Mitigate Concern	6. Details on How Concerns Were Addressed, Including Avoidance or Mitigation Measures	7. Outcomes/Comments
				providing its response to CEAA IR3-45 (regarding additional information for alternative projects) to Tsuut'ina Nation once completed and, if requested, discussing the response. Alberta Transportation also met with Tsuut'ina Nation December 6, 2018 to discuss the response and mitigation table.			
123	October 28, 2016 Meeting with the Tsuut'ina Nation Consultation Office, Alberta Transportation, Stantec, and DEMA Land Services	Environmental Assessment Information Sharing	Tsuut'ina Consultation Director requested information on what was occurring on the Environmental Assessments being undertaken for the Springbank Off-stream Reservoir.	At the meeting held on October 28, 2016, Stantec agreed to provide the Tsuut'ina Nation an outline of the work being undertaken for the EIA required by the CEAA when that work was completed. At the meeting held on October 28, 2016, Alberta Transportation made an offer that Stantec could come into the Tsuut'ina community and undertake a workshop related to the EIA underway at the Springbank SR1. No response was received from Tsuut'ina Nation. Workshops to discuss the TLRU sections of the EIA (Volumes 3A and 3B) were held March 1, 2, 6, and 7, 2018 on the Tsuut'ina reserve.	None at this time.	None at this time.	Ongoing: Working with First Nation
124	April 21, 2016 Meeting with Tsuut'ina Nation, Alberta Transportation, and DEMA Land Services	Information sharing	Tsuut'ina requested a copy of a Letter of Objection from a Treaty 7 Nation mentioned in the CEAA submission.	At the meeting held on April 21, 2016, Alberta Transportation indicated they could not share the letter as it was private communication, and recommended that Tsuut'ina inquire directly with that Treaty 7 Nation.	None at this time.	Alberta Transportation advised that it could not provide the requested document because it was a private communication.	No further action required.
125	July 15, 2017 Phone calls between Chief Lee Crowchild and Dallas Maynard.	Confirmation of SR1 Site Visit protocols	Chief Crowchild did not want DEMA or Alberta Transportation accompanying his Consultation teams when they were in the field on their Site Visits	Alberta Transportation agreed that no one from DEMA/Alberta Transportation would accompany Tsuut'ina into the field. Confirmed that Alberta Transportation would arrange the access to each of the SR1 properties and would maintain as safe a work environment as was possible and would provide daily COR Hazard Assessment reviews prior to commencing the Site Visits.	The Tsuut'ina Consultation technicians proceeded to inspect the various SR1 properties with DEMA/Alberta Transportation remaining at the property perimeter.	Alberta Transportation agreed not to accompany Tsuut'ina consultants into the field.	The site visits proceeded as requested by Chief Crowchild. No further action required.

