Appendix 15-A

Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
American Dipper		✓			ECCC recommended that American Dipper be included on the list of representative migratory bird species for the Project.	Comment received from ECCC during the October 15, 2015 Working Group Meeting.	American Dipper was identified as a VC in the provincial Application Information Requirements (AIR) in 2018.
Western Toad		✓			Determining the migration movement of western toads at both spatial and temporal scales would be beneficial for the assessment of potential project impacts, and allow for more productive mitigation measures (e.g., identifying peak migration periods and mortality hotspots).	Comment received from ECCC during the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	Multiple season detection/non-detection data and key (stage-specific) habitat variables were used to explain and predict western toad occurrence as a function of habitat characteristics. Road sections in proximity to potential breeding sites and/or emergence pathways were identified during habitat modelling and used to inform impacts assessment (and to focus mitigation and monitoring efforts).
Western Toad	✓				Western toads are aquatic for a relatively small proportion of their annual life cycle, yet all of the sampling effort conducted focused on breeding (wetland) habitat. Were ephemeral seeps and temporary pools that also provide suitable breeding conditions) sampled representatively? Having information on terrestrial abundance, distribution and macro- and micro-habitat use would assist in determining the importance of the project area or toads, the magnitude of impacts at the population level, and the full range of mitigations and habitat restoration. It may also assist in mitigating mortality of these species during mine construction and operation.	Comment received from the KNC during the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	Western toad sampling effort focused on potential wetland breeding habitats (n=31). Ephemeral seeps and temporary pools (e.g., puddles, ditches) were also sampled (n = 23). The sites were sampled over multiple years during May, June, July, and September and were located throughout the Terrestrial LSA in different habitat types. A considerable amount of wildlife encounter surveys (>150 km) were conducted across the Terrestrial LSA, which resulted in 11 detections of adult western toad. These data were used to inform models describing terrestrial habitat use by western toad. This approach elucidates the potential western toad emergence pathways, forage habitat, and hibernacula in the Terrestrial LSA that, together with the potential breeding locations, allows NWP to adequately estimate potential impacts from the Project and develop appropriate and comprehensive mitigation measures as required.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Northern Goshawk Nest Surveys			✓		Consideration of Northern Goshawk nest surveys.	Comment received from the KNC during the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	NWP did not complete targeted nest surveys within the Terrestrial LSA because the landscape is fragmented and available habitat is considered poor to moderate. The additional surveys completed in summer 2019 provide further understanding of suitable nesting habitat. No current information on active and alternative nesting information is available from FLNRORD. TEM data were used to further identify potential habitat.
Northern Goshawk Surveys	✓				Normally, call playback surveys in the nesting season are undertaken as a way to determine whether nesting territories are occupied and as a means to find occupied nests that may need protection. Follow-up foot searches should be conducted for responses during call-playback surveys. Often an occupied nest is found in close proximity to other evidence of use and if these other signs are found during foot searches for nests, it builds the case for nest site occupancy, even if the active nest is not found. Stands of age classes 6, 7, 8, 9 should be targeted for stratified random surveys during the breeding period. Overall, data gaps are significant, populations are known to have declined dramatically, and habitat is known to be limited and not meeting ecological thresholds or land use targets in the Elk Valley.	Comment received from the KNC on July 16, 2019 in response to the information from NWP provided above.	It is NWP's professional opinion that surveys conducted to date are sufficient to adequately determine, through modelling, the existing Northern Goshawk occurrence and habitat availability within the Terrestrial LSA in order to meet the requirements of the AIR. The RISC standard for raptors states that birds often will travel long distances to respond to call playback surveys; thus, playback itself is not useful for locating nests. No perches, plucking posts or other sign was recorded during habitat assessment, walk-through surveys, or other field work. Wildlife tree data has been collected across the Terrestrial LSA and was used to further support modelling. The RISC standards for raptors states that it is important to consider the objective of the study due to the amount of time it takes to locate nests, and the potential disturbance it will cause to the birds. Given that the objectives of the surveys were met through call-playback surveys and habitat assessments, specific nest surveys were not undertaken.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Aquatic Furbearers	✓				Aquatic furbearers and potential to obtain site-specific carcass data.	Comment received from the KNC during the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	No site-specific aquatic furbearer carcass data were obtained, as no aquatic furbearers were trapped in the Project area during the 2019-2020 season.
Seral Stagedata	✓				Evaluate the use of seral stage data for all wildlife and vegetationstudies and results. Large standing snags with suitable cavities for denning are most limiting for marten (in addition to CWD, as mentioned). So it would be important to conduct stratified random sampling on the density of live and dead standing trees (by tree species, wildlife tree decay class, diameter and height class, and with specific features present, such as large cavities) in different seral stages and forest types to address this limiting requirement. The goal would be to be able to quantify suitable denning trees per ha based on field data collected). Please confirm that this is being done	Comment received from the KNC during the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	The data and analyses are stratified by seral stage for all wildlife and vegetation field studies. Seral stage was used as a variable in VC habitat models where it is known or expected to be a determining factor for the species (e.g., American marten, wolverine, lynx, moose, elk, woodpeckers, Northern Goshawk, western toad, bats, etc.). It is recognized that large standing snags with suitable cavities for denning, in addition to CWD, are critical (limiting) habitat components for American marten. In order to quantify these limiting factors, ground-based habitat data on CWD and potential denning trees for American marten have been collected using a stratified random sampling approach (i.e., plots located across different seral stages and forest types). At each plot, data on CWD (relevant for both American marten and lynx prey and for American marten security cover) and potential denning trees were recorded (snag density, species, decay and diameter class and other relevant features [e.g., cavities and their location on tree]). These data were used to quantify suitable denning trees per square kilometer and were used to inform habitat models to quantify American marten habitat selection, occurrence, and distribution. Additional habitat data on wildlife features (e.g., snags, coarse woody debris) were collected in 2019.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Mountain Goat	✓				Discuss mountain goat as a potential Valued Component and confirm rationale for exclusion of species in the Valued Components document.	Comment received from the KNC during the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	To address the valid concerns around assessing potential project effects on mountain goats, NWP has included an effects assessment of mountain goats under the bighorn sheep VC. The baseline surveys for ungulates conducted for the Project have recorded both bighorn sheep and mountain goat data, which (together with provincial data) allowed for the use of species-specific habitat models for bighorn sheep and mountain goat. The resulting habitat models fulfilled the baseline measurement indicators required in the AIR for monitoring and impacts assessment for both species. Specifically, the models provide baseline estimates of 1) site-specific species occurrence, 2) species distribution, and 3) habitat availability (i.e., habitat quality and quantity). As the sampling was stratified to include landscape heterogeneity and connectivity areas (e.g., Project footprint, Grave Crossing), the models were used to assess potential effects of landscape change and identify potentially feasible mitigation strategies (e.g., crossing structures and locations).
Bat Field Surveys	✓				Re-evaluate bat surveys completed to date and potential timing of additional surveys to evaluate seasonality changes and maternal roost sites (if required, consider surveys in early and late season. Given this known habitat selection for roosting sites, it would be important to have data on the abundance and distribution of potentially suitable roost trees (by sampling stratified random plots (by tree species, decay and diameter class,	Feedback received from the KNC on July 16, 2019 as a follow-up comment to the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	Maternal roost sites for little brown myotis are anticipated to occur in the Terrestrial LSA based on bat surveys completed in 2017 and the finding of 1 juvenile and 2 post-lactating females (see Chapter 15, Section 15.6.2 and Appendix 15-B). Additional surveys to evaluate seasonality changes were not conducted. Seasonal habitat needs for bats were evaluated for the Terrestrial LSA by considering the factors most limiting to bats in the winter and summer seasons. Habitat for bats comprises hibernacula (winter habitat) and

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
					and with specific features like sloughing bark/cracks) in different seral stages and forest types. This data will permit the abundance and distribution of high value roost trees to be estimated by seral stage and forest type. I assume this data is being collected, along with data on seral stage and canopy cover? Please confirm. I am still not clear on whether field studies will be conducted to capture bats, radio-tag them and follow them to their roosts, so that these sites can be identified or is this is what is meant by "ground-truthing" roosts and hibernacula?		suitable foraging areas within commuting range to structures used for roosting or maternity colonies (summer habitat). Myotis species generally roost in tall, large-diameter snags that are in the early to middle stages of decay and located in open areas within mature forests. Predictive modelling based on known locations of summer foraging areas and juvenile or post lactating females, known distances travelled between foraging and roosting sites (other studies), and forest structure (seral stage, canopy closure and snags) was used to identify stands of forest likely to be used by myotis for roosting and maternity colonies in the Terrestrial LSA. This information was also used to predict other locations of hibernacula (based on karst topography and moisture). It is recognized that roosting trees are important habitat components for bats. In order to quantify these important limiting features for bats, NWP collected ground-based habitat data on potential roosting trees using a stratified random sampling approach (i.e., plots located across different seral stages and forest types). At each plot, the trees were classified to species, decay and diameter class, and other relevant features are recorded that may support bats (e.g., sloughing bark and cracks). These data were used to estimate the abundance and distribution (per km^2) of potential roosting trees, which in turn was used as a variable in the habitat models.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
							Since hibernacula (winter habitat) is a critical limiting habitat for Bats, additional data and information on bat occurrence and distribution during fall and winter within the Terrestrial LSA was obtained by by conducting additional acoustic monitoring in fall/winter 2019-2020. Efforts involved monitoring key areas to identify whether potential winter habitats used by overwintering little brown myotis are occurring within the Terrestrial LSA. Considering that radio-tagging methods are highly invasive (especially for small-bodied mammals), we find radio-tagging unwarranted at this stage of the Project.
Bat Field Surveys	✓				Assess need to conduct additional capture studies for northern myotis and need for tagging surveys to identify maternity roosts.	Feedback received from the KNC on July 16, 2019 as a follow-up comment to the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	Given the existing data available for northern myotis in the Terrestrial LSA, further live-capture studies are not justifiable or needed at this time. Predictive modelling was used to identify potential maternal roosting areas, given the current data on specific habitat features (e.g., stands of mature trees with cavities and sloughing bark suitable for maternal roosting) associated with detection locations. These data and information were used to identify important habitats (e.g., forest stands and foraging areas) important for northern myotis.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Bat Field Surveys	✓				My understanding was that northern myotis are relatively uncommon in the LSA (and Crown Mountain area), and that their detection during field studies was considered a bit of a range expansion. Is this correct? If so, would it not important to undertake some actual capture and tagging work, to determine what types of roosts they use locally, instead of applying data from the wetter ICH (e.g., Revelstoke National Park) to this local area. To interpret impacts, one needs an understanding of local population abundance as well as local habitat use and selection. Do we have sufficient data gathered locally to make sound conclusions on population and habitat impacts to northern myotis?).	Feedback received from KNC on July 16, 2019 as a follow-up comment to the May 1, 2019 Terrestrial Working Group Meeting.	It is difficult to say whether the occurrence of northern myotis in the Terrestrial LSA would be a range expansion as their documented range is based on a limited survey effort and logistical challenges with surveying for bats (ECCC, 2018). However, year-round resident populations of northern myotis are known to occur outside of this documented range, such as in eastern Montana (Montana Field Guide, 2019). Further, considering known habitat requirements for this species, the older closed-canopy forest stands (COSEWIC, 2013) present in the Elk Valley represent suitable potential habitat. Acoustic evidence from the baseline studies suggests that northern myotis (and eastern red bat) are present in the Terrestrial LSA. Despite mist netting efforts, neither species was physically captured to confirm presence. Given these species' rare occurrence in the region, additional acoustic monitoring work was conducted in the fall and winter of 2019 in the Terrestrial LSA (see Appendix 15-B).
Wildlife RSA Size	✓				As a rule of thumb, if the RSA includes BEC ecosystem types that are not represented in the LSA or the Project footprint that is a good indicator that the RSA is too big. Are you considering different RSAs for different taxa?	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	We consider how reasonable the models are going to be based on the quality of data driving the models, and how confident we are in the species' habitat associations. The RSA for large mammals should be large enough that we can include metapopulations. If we have sampled more than 30% of the area across which we are predicting from our model, our predictions should be less diluted.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Transboundary Effects		✓			How will transboundary movement into the US be incorporated?	Comment received from IAAC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	NWP attempted to account for transboundary movements by extending the Terrestrial, Birds, Bats, and Amphibians, and Grizzly Bear RSAs to the border. The model would become diluted if we extended the RSA into the US as we do not have data to incorporate there.
American Badger	✓				There are other rodent species that badger rely on for prey, e.g., pocket gopher, yellow-bellied marmot, and least chipmunk. We don't know the scope and breadth of badger prey in the Elk Valley so you should include some precautionary requirements when interpreting this data.	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	We also did surveys for pocket gopher, which did not emerge as predictive as Columbia ground squirrel in the badger model. Modelling habitat values for wildlife carnivores tends to be most determined by primary prey, which is supported by the literature. Pocket gophers were incorporated into the baseline and we have a map of their distribution.
Other Species Needs	✓				Prey, road mortality, and stress levels are not directly captured in the habitat model. How have you integrated the habitat modelling approach with other needs for each species?	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting	It is fundamental that we include a fitness based definition of habitat, the set of factors that influence a species' survival and reproduction. The set of variables accounts for the various limiting factors that a species may respond to, including anthropogenic factors.
Model Sensitivity	✓				Are you able to do a sensitivity analysis on the accuracy of the models? There are certain things that don't come through in your modelling; for example, elk and intergenerational transmission of knowledge from older elk to younger elk for migrator corridors.	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	We have done quantitative model validation using independent telemetry or collar data sets and aim for 80% accuracy for the model predictions. Our approach follows the literature and other similar landscape predictive model approaches.
Model Sensitivity	✓				Your sensitivity is going to vary based on the depth of data you have, make sure you're really transparent about where you have independent datasets.	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	NWP will be very transparent about assumptions and limitations.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Field Data	✓				I hope that in addition to the sensitivity analysis, you have a really strong set of robust field data from different seasons and different periods of time. You need to anchor the models in what's actually in the territory.	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	NWP shared the models with people that know the area to make sure the image matches reality. Since fitness based variables were considered, there should not be a lot of dissociation. This approach is more informative than HSI models.
Connectivity Modelling	✓				Are you doing connectivity modelling for each VC, and have you done it at different scales?	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	Connectivity models were not developed for inclusion in the Application/EIS.
Model Validation	✓				Regarding validation of models within the LSA vs. RSA, there's an anticipation of an 80% fit between a model and an independent data set field validated in the RSA. Does the same level of fit exist between the model and verified data within the LSA?	Comment received from the KNC during the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	Spatial predictions maps were not produced unless they fit the data. A 10,000 iterations goodness of fit test was used. If it was not evident that the model fits the data from the Terrestrial LSA, it was rejected.
Terrestrial RSA Size	✓				KNC concern was expressed regarding the size of the Terrestrial RSA being proposed, and used American badger as an example of a species for which the large RSA would not be appropriate. In the case of badger for instance, this large RSA would include the East Kootenay Trench population of badger, which has been well-documented by the work of Trevor Kinley, Nancy Newhouse and others more recently. In discussions with Trevor, there is little evidence of individual badgers moving from the Trench into the Elk Valley and back, hence these areas need to be	Comment received from the KNC on November 23, 2020 as a follow-up to the October 21, 2020 Terrestrial Effects Working Group Meeting.	We consider how reasonable the models are going to be based on the quality of data driving the models, and how confident we are in the species' habitat associations. The RSA for large mammals should be large enough that we can include metapopulations. If we have sampled more than 30% of the area across which we are predicting from our model, our predictions should be less diluted.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
					considered as different population units. By using such a large RSA, the impacts on badger in the Elk Valley would tend to be diluted if the much larger numbers of badgers occupying the valley bottoms of the Trench are pooled with the fewer numbers in the Elk. Confining the badger RSA to the Elk Valley is a more reasonable approach, especially given that driest BEC units used by badger in the Trench are not even represented in the Elk Valley at all based on Land Management Handbook 71. Again, a good rule of thumb in delineating an appropriate size RSA would be to avoid selecting an area where several of the BEC units present have no overlap with the footprint and LSA.		
Woodpecker Surveys	✓				Given that this would trigger the general stewardship obligation under all living things for the Ktunaxa it is important that all of the guilds are included. There is a Project pathway that leads to woodpecker with loss of old growth and mature forest, Marlene noted that the recommended methodology for woodpeckers is call-play back. Has this been done? We did not see it	Comment received from the KNC on November 10, 2020 as a follow-up to the October 26, 2020 memo on Migratory and Breeding Bird Richness and Abundance.	Call-play back surveys for woodpeckers were not completed. Observations of woodpeckers were recorded from 2014 and 2017 to 2019 through the following methods: • Breeding bird surveys; • Migratory bird surveys (point counts and transects); and • Incidental observations. Since woodpeckers have relatively large territories, and call-playback will attract the bird towards the source, the location of detection does not necessarily reflect either the habitat the bird is using or what features of the habitat the bird is using. Call-play back is limited to only some species,

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
							especially Pileated Woodpecker and American Three-toed Woodpecker. For multiple species broadcast, there may also be possible effects of broadcast of one species on another. Call-play back surveys may give some indication of species' territories, but it does not reveal what features within the territory they are using or what portion of available habitat they are using. Given the field survey effort and area of the Terrestrial LSA covered, observations would reflect information acquired by call-play back and also provide more specific information on habitat use. The breeding bird surveys alone may result (from in-circle and outside incidentals) in lower detection than call-play back surveys, but this was likely compensated for by the number of replicate surveys, and also provides an accurate indication of habitat use by recording species' extensive coverage of the Terrestrial LSA that would not be afforded by standard call-play back surveys (typically along a road). All observations of woodpeckers (sightings and vocalizations) and drumming and sign were recorded during all survey work. This provided • A great number of hours of observation; • A greater variety of sampling periods; • A greater number of repeat sampling although these were not necessarily standardized; and • A greater coverage area and diversity of environmental features than is afforded by standard call-play back surveys.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
							Incidental observations of woodpecker activity (e.g., cavities, and foraging sign) on wildlife trees within the Terrestrial LSA was also recorded throughout the field surveys. Wildlife trees were distributed across the LSA and observations were generally clustered. A total of 196 woodpeckers were observed in 130 locations (i.e., 79 incidental, 32 breeding bird point count locations, 15 migratory point count locations, and 4 raptor standwatch locations) over the four survey years. Red-naped Sapsucker were mostly frequently observed species, and Northern Flicker, Hairy Woodpecker, American Three-toed Woodpecker, Downy Woodpecker, and Pileated Woodpecker were also documented. The Grave Prairie area to the west and southwest of Grave Lake and wetlands throughout the Terrestrial LSA supported the most abundant woodpecker activity. Additional details on the locations of woodpecker and wildlife tree observations are provided in the Application/EIS.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Owl Surveys	✓				Other raptors of concern may include owls. The proponent did diurnal raptor surveys but did they do specific owl surveys?	Comment received from the KNC on November 10, 2020 as a follow-up to the October 26, 2020 memo on Migratory and Breeding Bird Richness and Abundance.	Yes, targeted owl surveys following Bird Studies Canada's Guidelines for Nocturnal Owl Monitoring in North America were completed in April 2018 at 15 survey locations. However, due to extensive snow cover in the Terrestrial LSA in March (the recommended survey month), surveys were conducted from April 21 to 26, 2018 instead. No owls were detected during the surveys, but incidental daytime observations of Barred Owl and Great Horned Owl were documented during other surveys (see Appendix 15-E).
Fall Raptor Migration Survey Effort	✓				The total survey effort for fall raptor migration is rather limited, and the time period over which these surveys were conducted is very condensed (squeezed into a few days, rather than spread out over the September to October migration period a day a week during optimal weather when a lot of raptor movement is predicted). Hours in fall 2019 are negligible (2.5 hours), relative to 2018. Goshawks were detected in both years and this species remains local, so likely a breeding territory somewhere. Did call playbacks confirm a territory?	Comment received from the KNC on February 9, 2021 as a follow-up to the October 26, 2020 memo on Migratory and Breeding Bird Richness and Abundance.	Survey effort in the fall was restricted by weather and access limitations. Goshawk observations in 2014, 2017, 2018, and 2019 were concentrated along the southern portion of Alexander Creek in the spring, summer, and fall, including two responses to call-playback surveys and one incidental observation near the same location, and nearby (within 5 km) observations at a wetland in Deadman Pass. These observations may indicate that the area along southern Alexander Creek is part of a Goshawk's territorial home range. Additional details, including a figure of all Goshawk observations in the Terrestrial LSA, are provided in the Application/EIS.

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
Bird Sampling Coverage	✓				Looking at the BEC unit distribution in the LSA, there appears little or no bird sampling coverage in the ESSFdkp and IMA, which we assume was due to access constraints (snow)?	Comment received from the KNC on February 9, 2021 as a follow-up to the October 26, 2020 memo on Migratory and Breeding Bird Richness and Abundance.	Correct, due to high elevation and restricted access, no surveys were conducted within the ESSFdkp. According to provincial BEC mapping, IMA in the Terrestrial LSA is limited to select locations near the Alberta border with access constraints due to the high elevation and remoteness of these areas.
Owl Surveys	✓				Owl surveys were apparently conducted in the latter end of April (April 21-28, 2018) and on June 4-11 2014, rather than as recommended in March due to access constraints imposed by snow cover. It should be clearly noted that the lateness of the surveys would dampen responses and detection probabilities in general and under-represent species that breed early and/or at higher elevations (e.g., Boreal Owl) that were not accessed.	Comment received from the KNC on March 23, 2021 as a follow-up to the October 26, 2020 memo on Migratory and Breeding Bird Richness and Abundance.	Owl surveys were conducted on April 23 to April 25, 2018 because site access in March was limited due to snow conditions. A discussion on survey results and limitations is provided in Appendix 15-E; owls are not included as Valued Components in the Application/EIS.
Fall Raptor Survey Effort	✓				Survey effort for fall raptor stand watches is low, especially in 2019 (2.5 -3 hours?), as well as overall (8 hours) as compared to spring surveys (22 hours) and this is directly reflected in the detection results. Also, the time period over which these surveys were conducted is very condensed (squeezed into a few days, rather than spread out over the September to October migration period a day a week during optimal weather when a lot of raptor movement is predicted. This suggests that additional effort spread out over the fall migratory	Comment received from the KNC on March 23, 2021 as a follow-up to the October 26, 2020 memo on Migratory and Breeding Bird Richness and Abundance.	Lower numbers of observations across the Terrestrial LSA during the fall may be due to the low abundance of raptors moving through the LSA, the limited survey window and duration of the surveys, or the limited number of survey locations. In addition, surveys conducted in October may have occurred during weather that was too cold for significant raptor activity. However, variation between spring and fall raptor counts is not uncommon, as frequently observed at the RMERF Mount Lorette monitoring station in Alberta (see Appendix 15-E).

Table 15-A.1: Summary of Consultation Feedback on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat VCs

Topic	Feedback Received*: IG	G	P/S	O	Consultation Feedback	Feedback Source	Response or Actions Identified
					season may have generated more representative results. Goshawks were detected in both years and this species remains local, so likely a breeding territory somewhere. Did call playbacks confirm a territory?		Concentrated Goshawk observations in the southern portion of the Terrestrial LSA along Alexander Creek may indicate that this area is part of a Goshawk's territorial home range (see Appendix 15-E).
Riverine Bird Survey Timing	✓				Riverine bird surveys were focused mainly in July (or the last 2 days of June) but for Harlequin Ducks, the appropriate survey period is May (on the Michel Creek project, numbers peaked in the first week of May) and by June and July females are either incubating or are rather cryptic with broods, respectively. Males have generally left by this time, so the timing of the surveys would have compromised detection probability of this species, which should be noted.	Comment received from the KNC on March 23, 2021 as a follow-up to the October 26, 2020 memo on Migratory and Breeding Bird Richness and Abundance.	Riverine shoreline surveys are labour and time intensive, and to minimize disturbance to riverine bird populations, the survey window was selected to encompass the potential occurrences windows of as many riverine species as possible. Spotted Sandpiper (another Project Valued Component) does not arrive in the Rocky Mountains until late May or early June, so early May surveys would not detect this species. As per the RISC standard for riverine birds, early surveys may also contain a significant proportion of transients.

* IG = Indigenous Group (group specified in feedback source); G = Government (provincial or federal agencies); P/S = Public/Stakeholder (Interest group, local government, tenure and license holders, members of the public); O = Other