



COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING PROGRAM BOARD

Response to 2013 Superior Watershed Partnership (SWP) Work Plan

Version Dated January 4, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the CEMP Bylaws, the response by the CEMP Board to the 2013 SWP Work Plan is provided here. In future years, the Board **\$** receipt of the plan and the response is anticipated to meet the timeline of November 30 envisioned by the CEMP Agreement. As with any new venture SWP, Rio Tinto and the CEMP Board are working closely to demonstrate diligence and mutual respect in meeting expectations in a timely way. During 2013 each group will have an opportunity to explore the feasibility of meeting the November 30 deadline or modifying the response date.

At the December 19, 2012 CEMP Board Annual Meeting, CEMP Board members, SWP representatives and Rio Tinto-Eagle representatives identified the intended &udiences+ or consumers of the SWP work plans. The CEMP Board interpretation is that these audiences are:

a) The CEMP Board;

b) Members of the public interested in scientific data reported in an understandable summary;
c) Members of the public (as % aterested by standers+) who trust that SWP will report accurately the data being collected (by both Rio Tinto-Eagle and SWP);

d) SWP scientists coordinating with Rio Tinto-Eagle within their monitoring framework; and,

e) Other communities who choose to engage in future collaborative efforts with mining companies (thereby having replicable monitoring models).

These groups are listed here as a reminder to the CEMP Board in reviewing future SWP Work Plans.

REVIEW AND OBSERVATIONS

- 1. The work plan continues to be organized and thorough (transportation route will be addressed), and speaks to the audiences identified in the *CEMP Board Response to the SWP 2012 Work Plan*.
- 2. Funding for 2013 appears to support the monitoring described, using existing Rio Tinto monitoring locations as appropriate to minimize duplication costs. It is not

clear if there is contingency funding for any unforeseen circumstances that may require more analysis.

- 3. The inclusion of additional information recommended by the CEMP Board should be helpful to the reader. For example, the Plan includes a list of acronyms, the definition of a sampling technique and greater description of analysis within the narrative text of the Plan, and detailed site maps.
- 4. Realizing it is probable that revisions to the Plan will be required (by its very nature of the work being done), dating this document is welcomed. And establishing a consistent means during the year to modify a portion of the Plan will allow the reader to determine the most current version and minimize printing cost.

SUMMARY

- The Plan seems as complete as any of this nature can be reasonably and reflects the expertise of the professionals involved. It describes in detail the monitoring to be done. And, it addresses the CEMP Board precommendations from 2012 to assist the many audiences who may be interested to understand what is intended. A separate page listing the titles of the tables and figures may prove helpful, especially in 2014 as more detail is added.
- 2. The question of sufficiency in funding will be addressed during the Plance implementation this year, as will the reasonableness of a timeline for submitting a plan for the following year and the CEMP Board response.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Perhaps a brief summary or commentary on budget allocations for anticipated and unanticipated monitoring (or how additional funding will be secured, if concerns arise) could be helpful in assisting the CEMP Board to comment on the adequacy of the budget.
- 2. The three parties in the CEMP Agreement will want to agree on a reporting structure and timeline for sharing recommendations, and for how the written modified to the Plan will occur. This discussion and decision should take place in the first quarter of 2013.

Submitted by CEMP Board Members: Richard Aho Lawrence Carey, III Pamela Christensen Nancy (Wiseman) Seminoff, Chair