

**October 11, 2012**

**Bonnie Cameron - Fort St. James, British Columbia**

**The View Hotel  
309 Sturat Dr. West  
Fort St. James, B.C.  
VOJ 1P0**

October 10, 2012

Shelley Murphy

Executive Project Director

Environmental Assessment Office

PO Box 9426, Stn Prov Govt

Victoria B.C.,

V8W 89V1

RE: **Proposed Amendment to the Mt > Milligan Copper-Gold Environmental  
Assessment Certificate-Public Opinion**

We have written a previous response dated June 6, 2012 with regards to the proposed onsite camp or as previously titled a "Hotel/Camp facility". When the original RFP went public on June 1st, it was on the basis of a 300 bed facility with "a number of options are being considered, including a fully serviced hotel, and modular camp-style facilities." Our understanding of this RFP was to accommodate the mine workers and attract workers outside of the region. The current proposed amendment is now for a 450 bed hotel/camp. This will allow the hotel to also accommodate contractors, maintenance personnel, visitors etc further take revenue from Fort St. James. It seems with the continued proposed amendments, there is less economic

sustainability for Fort St. James. Accommodating non-operations workers will directly impact other lodging facilities in the areas such as: camp sites, bed and breakfast, motels and our hotel. There is also concern of competing with the wages the mine will be able to offer the personnel for the "hotel/camp". Having a full serviced hotel on site will create jobs for hotel staff; however, it will also make it more difficult for local lodging facilities to retain and/or hire the required staff for their own lodging facilities. From the proposed amendment it is obvious this is driven from a business perspective rather than an environmental perspective. There is little focus on how Fort St. James will have any social or economic benefits by constructing an onsite camp or relocating a rail loadout facility from Fort St. James to Mackenzie. We need to hear from Mt. Milligan, how Fort St. James will be positively impacted by the mine.

If a camp is the only solution to attracting workers to Mt. Milligan, we support this; however, this camp should not be extended to other temporary employees, contractors or service sectors. Fort St. James could benefit from these individuals spending time in the community and supporting the economic growth of the community.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Cameron

The View Hotel

---

**Shawn Julian - Fort St. James, British Columbia**

For Shawns notes:

#### The Environmental Assessment Process

B.C.'s environmental assessment (EA) process provides a mechanism for reviewing major projects to assess their potential impacts. B.C.'s environmental assessment process is important to ensure that major projects meet the goals of environmental, economic and social sustainability. The assessment process is also needed to ensure that the issues and concerns of the public, First Nations, interested stakeholders and government agencies are considered.

The Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) manages the assessment of proposed major projects in British Columbia as required by the Environmental Assessment Act (Act). The assessment process examines major projects for potentially adverse environmental, economic, social, heritage and health effects that may occur during the life cycle of these projects. The process includes:

- opportunities for the involvement of all interested parties;
- consultations with First Nations; this does not exclude individual groups
- technical studies to identify and examine potential significant adverse effects;
- strategies to prevent, or reduce, adverse effects; and
- development of comprehensive reports summarizing input and findings.

#### What projects are reviewable?

Projects that may need to go through the environmental assessment process include the following:

- industrial projects: chemical manufacturing, primary metal and forest project industries;
- energy projects: power plants, electric transmission lines, natural gas processing or storage plants and transmission pipelines;
- mine projects: coal and mineral mines, sand and gravel pits, placer mineral mines, construction stone and industrial mineral quarries and off-shore mines;

#### Projects become reviewable in three ways:

1. The Reviewable Projects Regulation provides for a broad range of major projects to be automatically reviewable if they meet certain thresholds; such as, area or production volume. Most major projects are reviewable based on this regulation.
2. Ministerial Designation by the Minister of Environment who has the authority to direct the review of projects which are not automatically reviewable under the Reviewable Projects Regulation.

3. Proponent "opt-in" whereby a proponent may request that the EAO consider designating its project (that otherwise would not be reviewable) as a reviewable project, and the EAO agrees with and orders such a designation.

While EAO frequently encourages First Nations to bring their interests and concerns to the working group for consideration, EAO will also engage in separate consultations with First Nations in cases where a First Nation declines to participate on a working group or where the EAO determines that such consultation should be undertaken.

#### Minister's Decision

Upon completing and assembling the materials referenced above, the Executive Director submits them to two ministers for decision – the Minister of Environment and another minister responsible for that category of reviewable project. For example, the decision on a proposed mine would be made by the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources.

After the ministers receive this package, they have 45 days in which to make a decision. They must consider the assessment report and the documents that accompany it, and may also consider any other matters they believe are relevant to the public interest when they make their decision. A key factor ministers will consider is whether the Province has satisfied its legal duty to consult with and to the extent appropriate, accommodate First Nations. *Again no mention of a particular Band*

When making the decision, the Minister has three choices:

1. issue an environmental assessment certificate with any conditions they consider necessary;
2. refuse to issue the certificate; or
3. require further study or assessment.

Once the minister makes a decision, the EAO notifies the proponent, government agencies (including provincial permitting agencies) and First Nations of the decision. The EAO, at this point, posts the assessment report, the executive director's reasons and recommendations, the information bulletin and the environmental assessment certificate, if issued.

*I would speculate that the same would apply when trying to rewrite the original document*

#### Further Considerations:

*Does a public meeting in FSJ if have any real merit if Contractors, allegedly, are building Load Out (Mt. Milligan Ore) facilities in the town of Mackenzie without previous consultation as provided by the original EA.*

*The original EA was granted under certain conditions, the Mt. Milligan Site was to be operated with no permanent Camp, employees transported to site from either Mackenzie or FSJ.*

*Under which the voiced expectation was that both Communities would equally share in any economic revitalization to their respective communities*

*If the original EA is to be considered as a valid document, then any significant changes to said document must then come under automatic, independent review.*

*The suggestion that a permanent Camp be included in the EA process automatically deems the original process null and void because of its significant impact economically, environmentally and socially on two small northern communities.*

---

October 09, 2012

## Mackenzie Chamber of Commerce - Mackenzie, British Columbia



### MACKENZIE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Box 880, 88 Centennial Drive  
Mackenzie, BC V0J 2C0  
Phone: (250) 997-5459  
E-Mail [office@mackenziechamber.bc.ca](mailto:office@mackenziechamber.bc.ca)

Shelley Murphy  
Executive Project Director  
Environmental Assessment Office  
PO Box 9426, Stn. Prov. Govt.  
Victoria, B.C. V8W 9V1

October 4, 2012

Dear Shelley,

The Mackenzie Chamber of Commerce is providing this letter, to state our support for the proposed amendments to the Mt. Milligan Copper-Gold Environmental Assessment Certificate.

- 1) Construct an onsite camp for workers during operations
- 2) Relocate a rail outload facility from Fort St James to Mackenzie (including use of Forest Service Roads between the mine site and Mackenzie).

The most detrimental effect on Mackenzie would be the discarding of these applications. Mt. Milligan is a valued partner for our Business Sector. They respond to our community as a whole with support second to none.

Ultimately, the only conclusion for the Mackenzie Chamber of Commerce would be the approval of these amendments. This will help ensure the continued and successful operations of the Mt. Milligan Site which can only bring positive results to Mackenzie.

Sincerely,

/s/ Peter McGaffin  
President  
Mackenzie Chamber of Commerce

Jarley Morgan  
Office Manager  
Mackenzie Chamber of Commerce

ePIC	DM
RECEIVED	DSPP
	MCS
	PAD
	PAS
	PAD
	ePIC
Log #	Other
Environmental Assessment Office	

10/09/2012 14:46 #668 P.001/001

FROM: MACKENZIE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE To: 12503872208



September 28, 2012

## Fort St James Chamber of Commerce - Fort St. James, British Columbia



Fort St. James Chamber of Commerce  
and Visitor Information Centre  
115 Douglas Ave. P.O. Box 1164  
Fort St. James, BC V0J 1P0  
Ph: (250) 996-7023 Fax: (250) 996-7047  
email: fsjchamb@fsjames.com

June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012

Andrew Wheatley  
Box 1164  
Fort St. James, BC  
V0J 1P0

Chris Parks (Project Officer)  
Environmental Assessment Office  
BOX 9426 STN PROV GOVT  
VICTORIA BC  
V8W9V1  
CANADA

**Re: The proposed amendments of Thompson Creek Metals Environmental Assessment**

Thompson Creek Metals is currently building and plans to operate the Mount Milligan Mine Project. In order to secure permission for the project, an Environmental Assessment was conducted and agreed upon. The company now proposes two amendments to the current Environmental Assessment. It is my understanding that while responding to the two proposed changes, it must be recognized that any changes to the original, finalized Environmental Assessment document may not be considered in isolation, but rather as an integral part of the EA Permit document in its entirety. So in re-opening the finalized EA document, it would follow that everything within it is also open to discussion.

While conceding (with objections) the amendment to install a *small operations camp*, the second amendment to change the load out site away from Fort St. James is vehemently opposed. Rationale is as follows.

The Proposal amendments state that (page 2) *"the two amendments do not undermine or materially alter the Environmental Assessment Office's original conclusion that the project will not have significant adverse effects."* This statement is in error as both proposed changes will have significant economic and socio-economic implications to the community of Fort St. James.



Throughout the initial application process, the communities of Fort St. James and Mackenzie were assured that employees of the mine could live in the community of their choice and that regular transportation to and from the mine site would be provided. This information was perceived as commitment to support of the communities, and was responded to with support from the community for the project. Further, businesses and community organizations invest significant time and resources in order to plan and prepare for future expansion. Anticipation of both increased population and traffic, based upon the original finalized Environmental Assessment, has guided numerous community plans, decisions, and events. I believe the social and economic resources invested in these plans and preparations will be completely negated by both proposed changes.

In the February 2012 External News release, Thompson Creek indicates that *"Given concerns raised by potential employees, residents, and others about traffic, travel time to site, road conditions, and safety, the idea of bussing our entire work force to and from site each day during operations is being reviewed, and the option of operating a small camp during operations is being considered."* Safety is paramount for any mine operation, including transport of employees to and from the work site. Further, while it is agreed that the (page 5) *"plan to utilize a four days on – four days off shift rotation, where possible and appropriate, during the operation phase will help encourage workers (even those that choose to stay in the operations camp during their shift rotation) to reside in the neighboring communities,"* it must also be recognized that the operation of the camp is advantageous to Thompson Creek Metals and disadvantageous to the community of Fort St. James because it will reduce the economic benefit to our community while increasing the pool of potential employees for the company to encompass a significant number of additional neighboring communities. The qualifiers *"where possible and appropriate"* are disconcerting because they imply no responsibility to maintain the four day rotation, allowing for longer shift rotations that would further increase the pool of workers accessible to the company while further reducing any social or economic advantage for our town.

The statement (page 6) that *"As a result of the operations camp, economic development opportunities will be created for local contractors and suppliers interested in camp supply and services."* is not substantiated with the current practices, because currently some of these services are contracted to out-of-province companies (e.g. food services are being provided by an Alberta company).

From a purely environmental perspective a "small camp" (we have since learned this camp could range in size up to 450 hundred people) would have a significant impact to the local environment. One of the keystones for community support was that the temporary mining camp would be just that, "temporary", and that the environmental impact caused by that camp

would be remediated (upon dismantlement). People working for the mine would then come from the two local communities. The recently announced plan for a camp housing 450 cannot be considered "small" and is not supported. Therefore, in conceding proposed amendment to add a small camp during operations, for reasons of safety and response to employee requests, it must be stated that Fort St. James will undoubtedly lose anticipated population growth, community revenue, and economic benefit.

The second amendment proposal to change the Load Out Site from Fort St. James to Mackenzie, on the other hand, is completely unsupportable both in terms of fairness or rationale. Our rationale is in bullet form below;

- The quote on page 2 of the assessment *"It was originally thought that such a commute would be approximately 60-75 minutes from Fort St. James, but in fact it is taking closer to two hours in each direction (depending on road and weather conditions), for a round trip total of up to 4 hours per day."* It has on occasion been a 4 hour round trip between the mine site and Mackenzie, but the maximum round trip total time between the site and Fort St. James has been significantly less. Having driven this route many times on both the old road system and the new one, I would argue that on average the return driving time to Fort St James is much closer to three hours, not four).
- (page 4) *"Total hauling distance between the project and Fort St. James in nearly identical to the hauling distance to Mackenzie (approximately 90km)"* is contradicted on page 4 of the Appendix which says, *"The total haul for trucks on this route is 93 km (8 km longer one-way than the Fort St. James option). But travel time is estimated to be 40 minutes longer since the road geometry and alignment is not as efficient."* This current difference represents a 10% increase in distance and a 25% increase in time on the Mackenzie route.
- (Appendix Page 9) *"Given the overall longer travel distances, and higher potential for a larger increase in maintenance activities, the Mackenzie option is likely to result in increased emissions from fossil fuel consumption compared to the Fort St. James option."* Given the 10% increase in distance and 25% increase in time on the Mackenzie route, it follows that there will be a significant increase of emissions from fossil fuel consumption on that route. Far more than would be negated by the *"reduction in busses travelling to the camp daily"* or the *transporting of product via McKenzie*.
- During this construction phase of the mine, Fort St. James has been cooperative and supportive in every measure, with little to no benefit. Understanding that all of the industrial transport related to construction of the mine has used the Fort St. James route, one of the most significant investments our community has made in support of the building project for the mine is the augmented level of risk tolerance due to the significant increase of heavy traffic through our town, and on our roadways.



- The Amendment Proposal document indicates that the two routes are similar but they are not. The Mackenzie route is longer, more circuitous, and is shared with off-road haul logging trucks with loads up to twelve feet wide making travel on this road not as safe as travelling on the North Road. If in fact, the two routes were similar, it would follow that both routes would be used to transport materials during the building phase of the mine. To date, all transport of building materials has been through the community of Fort St. James, on the very route that the Amendment Proposal requests be removed.
- (page 4) *"Once the upgrades (bridge replacements and re-alignment of road sections) associated with the Fort St. James – Mackenzie connector are complete, travel times are likely to be reduced but will remain longer than the Fort St. James option;"* (page 4). The Amendment Proposal erroneously equates the two load out routes as "options" when in fact the Fort St. James Route, approved in the original EA Permit document, is the established route. There is no option or "options" here in our eyes.
- In building a mine the costs / benefits are always considered. The burden or cost of building this mine has had some positive business benefits to our community, but there is also a cost to this positive business spin off. These costs are heightened community stress, pedestrian safety concerns, a huge increase in heavy traffic, and significant wear and tear on our roadways. Some consequences of these costs are the increased heavy industrial traffic which are the municipality's financial burden (local tax payer) of road use and repair in town, as well as, provincial costs related to the damage of Highway 27 and especially the North Rd. We were lead to believe that a benefit to the above mentioned costs would be a load out facility that would provide guaranteed jobs and spin-off revenues for the local community. It is grossly unfair to impose the burden of construction-related transport on the Fort St. James community and then route the product on a less-economical longer road system, verses the established, shorter and safer one to our town.
- Changing from the agreed-upon load out destination to the Mackenzie Route is also economically short-sighted for Thompson Creek Metals. In the short term the connector route is a scheduled resource road, maintained by the industry using it. In future, when timber supply is reduced, road maintenance will be the sole responsibility of Thompson Creek Metals. The established Fort St. James Route utilizes highways, maintained in large part by the province of British Columbia, where a long term partnership on road maintenance costs with the province would be very advantageous.
- Access to existing infrastructure and control of maintenance costs (Kemess load out site) is an implied cost saving, but as pointed out in the bullet above this option will be more costly to the mine in the long run.

- Citing the building of a small operations camp for "*safety reasons*", it then follows that the established Fort St. James route for a load out is the preferred route for the same reason, "*safety*".
- Changing the load-out from Fort St. James to Mackenzie will have an unfair, deleterious, adverse effect on the Fort St. James economy and community resource.

In conclusion, the one Proposed Amendment regarding the addition of a small operations camp was supported in the previous EA, because the anticipated costs (road infrastructure melt down, increased traffic flow, increased safety road hazard to local population, investments and preparations for future increases in population, and the social cost of transient construction workers, moving through and living/renting in our town) would be made up by the benefits to the community (increased business, increased tax base, increased population, increase social services, etc.). Clearly, we have not been told the whole story by Thompson Creek Metals in its strategic plans to bring the mine into production.

The second Proposed Amendment regarding the change of the already established load out route to Fort St. James is vehemently opposed as stated above. There has been too much time, effort, risk-tolerance and planning invested, based upon the initial award of the EA Permit to change routes.

I see no substantial argument for a change but we will continue to work closely with Thompson Creek Metals for the mines successful production start up, as well as, the safety and good of all business parties in our Town.

Sincerely,

Andrew Wheatley, President

Fort St James Chamber of Commerce

.cc Mayor Rob MacDougall and Council

.cc The Hon. John Rustad

.cc Christy Smith MBA (Superintendent, Community Affairs)

---

**Dave Dutrizac - Mackenzie, British Columbia**

I object to the amendment. This is for convenience only and the enviromental impact is not in consideration. The original enviromental impact assessment should stand.

---

### **Leonard Thomas - Fort St. James, British Columbia**

my comments are directed at thompson creeks metals. i am very diappointed with the application to re reroute the load out site to mckenzie bc.I am opposed to the amendment for several reasons.. first of all the initial plan by terrane metals was to locate the loadout site in fort st.james. i consider that a promise to the community. secondly as an employee of nakazdli band i have stated our interest in securing the the hauling opportunity several times to company officials.we also had plans to be able to provide fuel to the trucks that would were hauling to the load out site . this venture is on hold at the moment. for us it could be a lost opportunity. the road you are proposing to use to mcenzie is forestry road recently built for the purposes hauling logs.the other other reason to build that road was to connect ft st james to mckenzie and for tourist traffic as a round about scenery route.this road being new will have its share of traffic which in my humble opinion have problems being a gravel road. there is the safety factor as well for people commuting on that road during the winter months. these roads are narrow and not everyone has a call radio in there vehicles. the benefits to utilizing the north road to fort st james is the fact its a public that is wider for public safety. with the recent announcement by the province to upgrade the road it makes more sence to stay the course and have load out site in fort st james. the capital cost to build a load out site should not be to significant given the amount money thats already been spent by the company building the mine.

utilizing and existing load site out site on alease basis from kemess may be good for you in the short term but it does nothing for ft.st james.if kemess started operating again you would need to build anyway..

---

**September 27, 2012**

**Personal Information Withheld**

Attention Ms. Shelley Murphy

Sept 27/2012

Regarding the Mt. Milligan permanent camp.

I strongly oppose the idea of having a camp located at Mt. Milligan.

The following are my reasons;

- 1) Having a 350 man camp is environmentally irresponsible on our part. With this size of camp there definitely will be wildlife that will be displaced and or destroyed. You simply have to look at the current construction of Mt Milligan. There are coyotes that are being feed on a regular basis by camp residence. No matter what preventative measure maybe in place to protect our wildlife this future camp is simply too large to control and protect our wildlife.
- 2) Mt. Milligan is planning on having a path that workers can walk to and from work. What about the littering that will take place? What about the safety of the workers and wildlife? What about the environmental impact this area will have over a 20 year period.

---

#### **Personal Information Withheld - Mackenzie, British Columbia**

It was not the community's or Thompson Creek's first choice to have an operations camp, but in terms of safety and health of the employees, as a community member of Mackenzie, I see the benefit and I am for the proposed changes.

---

#### **Shannon Gauthier - Mackenzie, British Columbia**

I strongly disagree with Mt. Milligan's proposal for a full time camp rather than bus employees in from Mackenzie or Fort St James. Originally the mine had proposed to both of these communities that they would bring jobs to the local communities, emphasizing on jobs and housing. I think by doing this it will affect the economy of both of these communities in a negative way. There are a shortage of tradesman all over Canada at this time. Mt Milligan is not the only company seeking tradesman. You have to promote these two towns for all they have to offer and you will manage to bring tradesman and other workers to the area. Mackenzie has the cleanest freshest air , with beautiful lakes surrounding the town, we have a great recreation facility offering a gym, a pool, a public

library , a skating rink and we also have a ski hill & newly a skateboard park & we have affordable housing. We have a lot to offer and too much to put in one letter. It is a very friendly town that is safe . It is the perfect place to raise your children. This is how you need to promote our town. Let the tradesman know what the communities have to offer and offer them a job as well where they can travel home every night to be with their families. If you make it as appealing as possible which Mackenzie is, then I feel you will attract the employees that you require. If you have a camp you will get employees from all over Canada who will probably never step foot in Mackenzie. They will take their wages and spend them in their towns across Canada. If you bus people in daily they will live in the communities, they will shop in the communities , they will keep these communities going. I think it is a cop out to say the travel it too long. Workers at the mines in Tumbler Ridge travel by bus to work each way and they also have 14 to 15 hour days. It may be long hours but if you do a 4 on 4 off schedule then they have a break every 4 days to recuperate. What happened to the thousands of dollars that was contracted out to fix that road from Mackenzie to Mt Milligan mine site? I would be curious to know where those funds went if the road is not in the shape you expected it to be. The cost of running a full camp will be way more expensive than it would be to bus the employees in on a daily basis from the two communities. I hope you reconsider your proposal to now have a full time camp. Yes you have said you will bring the load out to Mackenzie which is a disappointment to Fort St James since they were told it would go there but either way at your discussion last night in Mackenzie it was stated that this load out would only create 3 to 6 jobs at the most.. Not a significant amount of jobs to keep the economy of Mackenzie going the way that having employees and their families live here would. Don't let us down. Please do what you first proposed and discussed for years prior to the building of this mine which is to bus the employees in from Mackenzie and Fort St James. Try promoting our town like I mentioned I don't think you have done this yet. I don't see anything about what Mackenzie has to offer on your website. Try it. I think you will attract the workers you need if you let them know what a great place Mackenzie is to live.

**September 26, 2012**

**Candice Henderson - Mackenzie, British Columbia**

I am not in agreement with a fulltime camp, originally the mine promoted itself to both communities as bringing jobs to the local communities emphasizing on jobs and housing as reported @ [www.cf-sn.ca/whats\\_new/news/mining/dirt\\_on\\_mount\\_milligan.php](http://www.cf-sn.ca/whats_new/news/mining/dirt_on_mount_milligan.php) "Smith spoke on the employment and sustainability goals of the project, mentioning the sustainability committee Thompson Creek has for the region, which provides an opportunity for some discussion with selected members of the community.

Their goal is a "mutually beneficial relationship with the community," said Smith, which appears to relate mostly to employment at this stage.

They are emphasizing the desire to hire locally from within the region of Fort St. James, Vanderhoof, Mackenzie and Prince George, and locals hoping to get on with the mine are encouraged to look at the updated website [www.mtmilligan.com](http://www.mtmilligan.com) or to contact the local office to find out how their skills might fit into the project. "There's a very strong need to have a lot of employees in the area and it's going to be a fairly interesting time," said Smith."

By having an onsite full time camp they no longer need to hire locally or promote either community to employees. They propose a 12 hour 7/7 shift which means that employees can come from anywhere in Canada and they will. With LOA and wages there is no need or economic benefit for potential employees to relocate to either community.

In the same meeting they mentioned looking at options like providing housing "When asked if the mine would be sponsoring any facilities within the communities to help attract or retain human resources, Carson said "one of the things we're looking at right now is housing ... we do intend in investing in communities, how we actually do that we haven't decided yet." Of course if they have a camp they no longer need to



worry about providing housing in either community.

They seem to lack incentive on ways to make the mine work for the two communities they convinced to support them with promises of community support, growth and sustainability. They need to look at alternative ways to attract employees that will support the local community, like they initially stated. Perhaps different shifting with travel time, which would cost much less than supporting someone in camp for 7 days at a time would be an alternative option.

In the Open house in Mackenzie they stated that they are having difficulty finding employees locally, especially trades and specialty workers, this is an industry wide problem, not one that is connected to the communities. They need to find ways to promote trades people coming to the local communities to live and to work, again, as they promoted to us. They have difficulty finding trades people to work in their Endako mine as well which does not have a camp and employs workers from communities such as Fort St James, Burns Lake, Vanderhoof which all have travel times of 45 mins to 1 and 1/2 hours. If you look at their own website all the positions for both the mill and the mine are technical/specialty positions engineers, supervisors, planners. All very high tech positions that without promotion of the community and incentives to relocate here would be very difficult to fill, as there are not too many of these professionals currently living in either community. It seems that the best incentive they can come up with is to offer a camp which will allow the trades to remain in their home communities and go home for 7 days to their families rather than relocate, which is a huge economic benefit to them.

In the same publication an article in November of 2011 "But once up and running in late 2013, the camp will be taken away and the vast majority of the 350 employees who will work at the mine will be living in either of the two communities.

"A lot of operations that are opened up nowadays, by necessity they are what are called 'fly-in, fly-out' operations, where you have a camp on that site, they fly in for a

couple weeks and they go out for their days off," Carson said Friday as he hosted a media tour of the site.

"With the location of this operation, we're able to run a community-based operation where people will be able to go home to their families every night.

"That has benefits to the employees themselves and also to the communities because, obviously, if you've got 360 people based in those communities that is going to have a positive impact."

The article goes on to talk about shifting "Four crews of about 60 people each - most of them heavy equipment operators - will each work two 12 hour shifts during the day and another 12 overnight, with a day off in between, followed by four days off.

Of course with this kind of shifting and the hour to hour and 1/2 travel time it would make for very long days for the workers however this is only one way of shifting there are several alternatives to their now proposed 7/7 12 hour shifts and a full time camp.

Furthermore, if you go onto their website there is absolutely no promotion of either community in their information. It is all facts about distance only to the mine. They do not appear to be making any effort to promote our communities to the "outside" potential employees.

Per quotes from their own website "Sustainability

A key consideration in the planning for the mine is ensuring that Mount Milligan is a valued partner in the communities in which we operate and in which our employees, contractors and suppliers live. The practice of working with our partners is one avenue Thompson Creek Metals uses to demonstrate our commitment to community enhancement. It is also a way for the company to play a constructive role in supporting the efforts of individuals and organizations committed to building a strong, sustainable region. This philosophy complements and extends the larger contribution

to sustainability made by the company's successful business activities.

## Community

The Mount Milligan project team is working together with communities, First Nations and stakeholders to create sustainable economic, social and environmental benefits during and beyond the life of the mine. Our goal is to support and leverage the development of local communities' capacity for a better future, and ensure our shareholders and general public remain informed and confident of our business practices."

We are committed to building durable relationships with local First Nations and with local communities to help them plan and develop policies, programs and projects that will contribute to their long-term social, economic and environmental sustainability."

It seems that all the promises to ensure a better future for our communities were just that "promises" but the kind that are made to be broken. You can't come into communities promising better futures, sustainability, commitment to the community etc etc just to get them on side so your project can go ahead and then say that we can't keep that promise now because "Originally, we thought we would be able to have all of our employees live in Fort St. James or Mackenzie and bus to work each day. However, despite road improvement, the drive from town to site taking about 1.5 hours each way - or +3 hours of travel each day. Shifts are 12 hours." WHAT DID THEY THINK TRAVELLING 95 KMS ON WINTER ROADS WOULD TAKE? Even on the highway with winter road conditions it is at least an hour to go 95 kms, if you have a lick of winter driving sense. "Shifts are 12 hours", change the shifts to include driving time. Maybe you have to hire more employees in order to have 3 instead of 2 shifts, it would still be less expensive than running a full time camp, and would be keeping a promise made.

As far as the Load Out Facility goes, it appears to make economical sense, as opposed to a full-time camp, however, it is another promise broken.

**Debbie Wallace - Mackenzie, British Columbia**

I am all for the rail re-load to be built in Mackenzie. I do not see how this could harm our community in any way. I think this would be a "win win" for all. I am not sure about the on site camp. I think it will benefit the mine in acquiring & retaining employees but, would hurt the economy of both Ft. St. James & Mackenzie by employees being able to live any place they choose instead of Ft. St. James or Mackenzie.

---