Shell's proposed JPME/PRM Compensation Lake and No Net Loss Plan Meeting Minutes

February 17, 2011

1:00 pm – 4:00 pm Sawridge Inn & Conference Centre - Ft. McMurray, AB

Attendees:

Shell: Jason Plamondon
Autumn EagleSpeaker
Rick Courtney
Cayla Winsor
Linda McNabb

CEAA: Mai-Linh Huynh
DFO: Marek Janowicz
ML 125: Fred (Jumbo) Fraser
ML 1935: Lyla Medas
May-Britt Jalenka

Agenda:

1. Update on Muskeg River
2. Compensation habitat location and option
3. NNLP Habitat Losses and Gains
4. Surrogate Stream Analysis
5. IFN Analysis – preliminary results
6. Muskeg River Dissolved Oxygen Modeling – preliminary results
7. Muskeg River Geomorphology Analysis

---

1) Update on Muskeg River

Shell provided participants with an update in respect of its previously proposed Muskeg River Diversion plans.

- Noted options still being assessed – No decision has been finalized.
- Noted that regardless of the mitigation alternative chosen, there would be no impact to the NNLP as Shell is contemplating 100% HADD for impacts to Muskeg River within mine footprint.

ML 125 expressed concern about mining through the river and advised they do not want to see a pipeline.

Shell noted that the diversion options being considered (i.e. alternatives to diverting the river through a pipeline) is proposed mitigation resulting from concerns expressed.

2) Compensation habitat location and option

Shell provided participants with information about the Compensation habitat location

- Shell provided an update regarding the proposed North Red Clay Lake – for MRME
- Advised that consultation ongoing
- Advised that North Red Clay Lake final lake location decision to occur end of Q211
- Shell provided information about the proposed location of South Red Clay Lake – used to provide compensation for JPME/PRM

ML 125 questioned about the purpose of the lake – impression it would be for tailings.

Shell advised that the lake is to compensate for Fish habitat removed – a DFO policy. No tailings would be put in the compensation lake.

3) NNLP Habitat Losses and Gains – preliminary results

   Shell provided participants with the preliminary results of habitat losses and gains for the proposed No Net Loss Plan
   - Advised of the modeled habitat disturbance and loss
   - Shell advised on stream impacts

ML 125 expressed concern regarding how useable models are and asked about validation.

Shell advised that validation of the model would take place through monitoring and comparing predictions. Also, Shell explained the models usability to calculate size of lake needed for habitat and fish growth.

4) Surrogate Stream Analysis – results
   Shell provided participants with the results of the Surrogate Stream Analysis.
   - Advised on the analysis of the net impacts of the future Muskeg River
   - Provided information on the other surrogate streams studied – Winefred River, Jackfish River, La Biche River, Muskeg River (Reach 3, 4)
   - Advised that the monitoring of fish species used in stream analysis

5) IFN Analysis – preliminary results
   Shell provided participants with the preliminary results of the Muskeg River IFN Analysis
   - Provided reach definitions and wetted width data

6) Muskeg River Dissolved Oxygen Modeling – preliminary results
   Shell provided participants with the preliminary results of the Muskeg River Dissolved Oxygen Modeling
   - Advised that the Muskeg River had low D.O. compared to surrogate streams

7) Muskeg River Geomorphology Analysis
   Shell provided participants information about the Geomorphology Analysis for the Muskeg River.
   - Noted that models indicate possible change of morphology in channel – over duration of time the predisturbance channel shape may narrow to adapt to the lower peak flows of full development
   - Advised that peak flows will be reduced, but process will be very slow - decades
   - Expressed that the channel has been stable for last 52 years
   - Noted that Geomorphologist studies to be included in appendix for the NNLP report

Comments/Concerns:

- ML 125 suggested that an advisory committee meeting or something of that effect would be more beneficial than a technical meeting.

- ML 1935 suggested that a plain language executive summary would be beneficial in assisting the Métis in communicating the results of this type of information with the community. Shell agreed that was a good idea.
- CEAA noted the ability for Metis to apply for technical funding
- ML 1935 expressed desire for opportunities to involve community members in the process
- ML 1935 expressed concern that technical meetings are not relevant to elders

Action:

Create plain language executive summary for draft NNLP