

R E P O R T O N T H E



National Workshop
on Environmental
Regulations
Affecting the
Mining Sector

T O R O N T O

April 8 & 9, 1998

COMPILED BY

Natural Resources Canada



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Part 1. The Federal-Provincial-Territorial Review of Regulations Affecting Mining	
Process	3
Preamble	4
Part 2. Comments or Observations Related to Federal Environmental Regulations Affecting Mining	
<i>The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)</i>	5
<i>The Fisheries Act (Sub-Section 35(2)) and the Navigable Waters Protection Act (NWPA)</i>	11
Metal Mining Liquid Effluent Regulations (MMLERs)	14
Conclusion	15
Appendix 1: List of Participants	17

Introduction

At the July 1997 Mines Ministers' Conference (MMC), in response to concerns about the need for further progress on regulatory reform, mines ministers charged the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Mineral Industry (IGWG) with preparing a government/industry report that reviews federal-provincial-territorial regulations affecting mining and proposes appropriate recommendations for their consideration at the 1998 MMC.

An IGWG/Industry Task Force was created to coordinate the review process and the preparation of the report for mines ministers. According to the guidelines prepared by the Task Force, each jurisdiction designs, implements and reports on its own review process. Individual reports will be synthesized in an overview report for submission to mines ministers at their next MMC in July 1998.

Reports received by April 3, 1998, were used to prepare a first compilation for discussion at a multi-stakeholder National Workshop on Environmental Regulations Affecting the Mining Sector that was held in Toronto on April 8 and 9, 1998. The purpose of the national workshop was to discuss the federal acts and regulations under review and their interactions with relevant provincial and territorial regulations. Reports submitted by Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, the Yukon and the federal government were used for this first compilation. The report submitted by Quebec was not used to prepare this synthesis because it did not cover the federal-provincial interaction. Nova Scotia and the Northwest Territories were unable to submit a report in advance of the national workshop, and Prince Edward Island did not submit a report because of the lack of mining activities in that province.

This report has been prepared to document the results of the national workshop, which was attended by representatives from provincial or territorial governments (9), industry (8), federal departments or agencies (7), environmental organizations (3), Aboriginal groups (2), labour (1), and legal practitioners (1). A list of participants is provided in Appendix 1.

Part 1. The Federal-Provincial-Territorial Review of Regulations Affecting Mining

PROCESS

A cooperative approach was prepared by the IGWG/Industry Task Force to facilitate coordination between federal, provincial and territorial governments. According to this approach, jurisdictions designed and implemented reviews that were appropriate for their respective priorities, needs and circumstances. They were also responsible for reporting on their review process; documenting success stories, areas of collaboration and good practices; and proposing recommendations and solutions to problems.

Components of the reviews are federal, provincial and territorial mining and environmental regulations that affect exploration, development, mining and closure, and the relationship between relevant provincial/territorial and federal environmental regulations and related decision-making processes. Priorities include reducing uncertainty, eliminating duplication, and removing unnecessary delays and costs while at the same time maintaining effective measures for environmental protection.

Comments and observations made by provinces and territories in relation to provincial and territorial regulations will be considered by their respective governments. Federal environmental regulations affecting mining, e.g., matters related to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (CEAA), the *Fisheries Act*, the *Navigable Waters Protection Act* (NWPA), the *Metal Mining Liquid Effluent Regulations* (MMLERs), and related decision-making processes, formed the core of the federally coordinated review. The relationship between those acts and regulations and relevant provincial/territorial regulations was the focus of the multi-stakeholder National Workshop on Environmental Regulations Affecting the Mining Sector that was held in Toronto on April 8 and 9, 1998.

Background information related to the federally coordinated review is documented in the *Report on a Federally Coordinated Review of Federal Environmental Regulations Affecting Mining in Canada*. It was based on the results of a Canada-wide consultation process conducted through an internet-based virtual workshop from January 19 to February 20, 1998. After closure of the virtual workshop, a multi-stakeholder group comprised of representatives from federal, provincial and territorial governments, environmental organizations, Aboriginal groups and industry convened at Cantley, Quebec, to discuss the results of the virtual workshop and to prepare, based on their personal experience and knowledge, a draft report on comments and observations related to the federal acts and regulations under review.

The results of the Cantley Retreat, to which were added the perspectives of individual jurisdictions, served as the basis for discussion at the national workshop. Participants reviewed the compilation with the objective to add, delete or modify issues identified for improvement and suggestions put forward in the compilation. They also identified other related areas of concern, as well as areas that should be submitted to an independent review.

PREAMBLE

Discussions at the national workshop were based on the principle that the objective of regulatory reform is not to reduce environmental protection, but to do it more efficiently and effectively.

The following section summarizes the results of the national workshop. It presents observations and comments in relation to the federal acts and regulations covered by the review. The workshop participants found common ground in many areas. As a result, the workshop report can, in many instances, be considered as providing comments, observations and options that could serve as the basis for further discussions without implying that all participants endorse all of the issues and options identified.

Areas where there was consensus include:

- **the need and opportunities for increased regulatory efficiency and effectiveness in meeting environmental protection objectives;**
- **the need for better communication and cooperation within and between governments, industry, environmental groups and Aboriginal communities;**
- **the need for better coordination within and between jurisdictions;**
- **the need to clarify responsibilities and requirements for environmental assessments (EAs), fish habitat compensation, and the permitting phases;**
- **the need for relevant, easily accessible information; and**
- **the need for greater transparency in decision-making processes.**

Some of the areas where workshop participants were unable to achieve consensus or where they felt the issues were too complex to be dealt with in the current context are:

- **adequacy of resources to meet environmental protection objectives, and whether new resources or reallocation of existing resources are needed;**
- **the extent to which overlap and duplication has been, or remains to be, a problem following the implementation of various harmonization initiatives; and**
- **early triggering of permitting and the EA process to cover exploration.**

Finally, while recognizing the need to address the issues of cumulative effects assessment, closure/reclamation and orphan mines, participants found that these issues should be considered for an independent industry/government/stakeholder review.

Part 2. Comments or Observations Related to Federal Environmental Regulations Affecting Mining

THE CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT (CEAA)

Predictability of Process

1. Interpretations of *Fisheries Act* triggers can introduce uncertainty to the initial scope of the EA. *Fisheries Act* authorizations and permits result in the EA being triggered too late in the project review process to allow for coordinated planning.

Options:

- Make the *Fisheries Act* a more predictable trigger through changes to the policy, the procedures or the legislation.
- Prepare guidelines to help proponents with the interpretation of *Fisheries Act* triggers.
- Work with companies from the earliest stage to allow for coordinated planning.

2. In the absence of other triggers, community concerns¹ may be sufficient to warrant a CEAA review.

Options:

- Consider using the discretionary mechanism within the CEAA (Section 28) to trigger a panel review where there is a sufficient public concern.
- Large screenings and comprehensive studies should also be covered by this discretionary mechanism.
- Consider, for the upcoming five-year review of the CEAA, expanding its range to better cover exploration activities. (There was no consensus on this suggestion. Industry indicated that exploration is an area where communication within and between governments could be improved. Some ministries (for example, resource ministries) are informed of exploration activities but this information is not made available to other ministries. Proper requests or notifications could be provided to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) through provincial ministries. It was also indicated that industry could work more closely with affected Aboriginal groups.)

3. There is uncertainty about the potential scope of an EA and, in particular, concern about unclear requirements for cumulative effects assessment.

Options:

- Incorporate the results from scoping-related court decisions into guidelines for Responsible Authorities (RAs) and participants.
- Apply new CEAA Practitioners' Guide on cumulative effects assessment.

¹ The CEAA refers to public interest rather than community concerns.

4. **There is a need to link cumulative effects assessment with regional planning. Mining project proponents cannot be made responsible for regional planning and collection of the general baseline information needed to develop regional management plans. Governments need to enhance their regional planning ability through the development of regional management plans based on general baseline information.**
 - **The Labour participant indicated that approvals need to be phased in according to the availability of information.**
 - **Aboriginal participants indicated that Aboriginal communities do not approve of the phased approach.**
 - **Representatives from the environmental community also expressed concerns in relation to cumulative effects assessment.**

Option:

- **Participants came to the conclusion that cumulative effects assessment and its relation to policy issues and general land-use planning cannot be resolved within the context of this federal-provincial-territorial review and deserves its own review.**

5. **Where land claims are in process or have been settled without completion of regulatory regimes, all participants in EA processes face greater uncertainty and complications.**

Options:

- **Promote early communication between proponent and Aboriginal people.**
- **Consider the use of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU)/Accords to ensure meaningful participation and improved certainty of process.**
- **As appropriate, implement clear nation-to-nation or company-to-community interim measures (Wahnapiatae Agreement in Sudbury).**

6. **There is a lack of clarity around the different responsibilities and requirements under EA and the subsequent permitting phase.**

Options:

- **Obtain input from stakeholders in preparing Terms of References (TOR) and clearly define and communicate the requirements under TOR for EA and the permitting processes.**
- **Ensure agencies, stakeholders and others involved in the EA process and the permitting phase continue to be involved with enforcement in order to provide for continuity and coordination of implementation of EA conditions of approval.**
- **Establish the appropriate level of technical detail required for EA that will foster effective evaluation, planning and assessment prior to proceeding to the permitting phase.**

7. **Uncertain or unduly extended timelines can create unnecessary delays and increased costs. Arbitrarily short timelines, on the other hand, can compromise the thoroughness of the process. The differences in the complexity of technical, social and environmental issues among different projects require**

varying commitments of time and resources. Due to fiscal constraints, the necessary resources are not always available for government to respond efficiently and effectively.

Options:

- Establish an approach to timelines that adequately reflects the complexity of the project and concerns.
- All participants in the EA process should outline their time requirements as early as possible in the process.
- Assign adequate resources for government to respond effectively to the EA requirements within the timelines identified.
- Explore and initiate alternate approaches for funding where insufficient resources exist to complete assessments in a timely manner.

Process Coordination and Integration

8. Mining is, for the most part, a provincially regulated activity, but federal statutes are often invoked. A lack of coordination between jurisdictions can create situations where either gaps or overlaps can occur, which results in costs to the proponent, participants, the environment, and health and safety.

Options:

- Increase understanding and action with respect to regulatory systems through improved communications.
 - Coordinate the tasks and requirements associated with the approval processes within or between federal, provincial/territorial, or other institutions of public governments.
 - Within an integrated process, the responsible agency should be determined on the basis of authority, resources and expertise.
 - Ensure that health and safety regulations are also considered.
- Alberta representatives indicated that the province wishes to take over administration of the whole EA process on the basis of duplication of regulatory activities between governments.
 - Representatives from the Aboriginal community stated that fiduciary responsibility for Aboriginal peoples rests with the federal government.
 - Representatives from the environmental community and the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (the Agency) stated their objection to this proposal.
 - The Agency representative indicated that the federal government has made commitments to reduce overlap and duplication in response to the recommendations contained in the Final Report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources entitled *Streamlining Environmental Regulation for Mining*. Many of the Committee's recommendations are related to working cooperatively to reduce duplication of regulatory activities. Some 94% of the Government's commitments have been, or are in the process of being, implemented. Important commitments delivered include the Federal Coordination Regulation, procedures for joint panel reviews, and signature of the *Canada-Wide Accord on Environmental Harmonization* and its related sub-agreements on EA, inspection activities and standards. The Agency is also monitoring the efficiency of the CEAA. The results of this monitoring activity will be used for the planned five-year review of the Act.

- The representative from l'Association minière du Québec indicated that boards where federal and provincial representatives work in cooperation are efficient.

9. A *Canada-Wide Accord on Environmental Harmonization* has been signed but not implemented.

Options:

- Encourage performance-oriented bilateral agreements in a timely fashion where capacity and resources exist to meet regulatory objectives.
- Establish clear criteria for effectiveness and efficiency in the implementation of bilateral agreements, including monitoring mechanisms to ensure performance and accountability.
- Information should be made available to assist new regulatory bodies established under claims legislation in realizing the benefits of adopting an integrated approach to EA.
- Ensure that environmental harmonization is translated into the highest level of environmental protection.

10. There is a need for better and more regular communication within and between governments, the mining industry and other stakeholders.

Option:

- Increase understanding and action with respect to regulatory systems through improved communications within and between governments, the mining industry and interested stakeholders.

Meaningful Participation

11. Aboriginal people are more than stakeholders. They have a usufructuary right to lands and therefore must have an ongoing role in decision-making concerning land-use issues, etc.

Options:

- In the absence of a land claim agreement, measures such as an MOU/accord can ensure meaningful participation and greater certainty of process.
- Round Table approaches can be useful in addressing the concerns of Aboriginal and other groups regarding regulatory issues related to mining.

12. Insufficient time, resources and information flow, combined with inadequate involvement in the early stages of an EA, are barriers to fair and effective participation.

Options:

- Adequate information flow and opportunities to participate meaningfully should be available throughout the entire EA process.
- There should be improved awareness and access to adequate intervenor funding sufficiently in advance of the intervention deadlines.
- Priority should be given to those most affected by, and/or closest to, the project.

- **Consideration should be given to the educational, technological and cultural differences among participants.**
- **Environment Canada and the Agency, together with the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME), are in the process of developing an annex to the *Canada-Wide Accord on Environmental Harmonization* that will include engaging in meaningful public participation and involvement with Aboriginal groups.**

Availability of Relevant Information

13. Existing information relevant to EAs is often dispersed among different companies, agencies and institutions. For a variety of reasons, including incompatibility, confidentiality and cost, valuable data sets may be difficult to access and analyze for EAs.

Options:

- **Relevant information should be placed into metadata directories.**
 - **Access to internet-based directories, databases and linkages between information sources should be developed and improved.**
 - **Useful historical information and case studies, be it in electronic form (e.g., CEAA CD-Rom) or traditional formats, should be archived and made available.**
 - **The information should be easily available and understandable.**
 - **There should be better distribution of practitioners' guidelines.**
14. Gaps in baseline environmental, social and economic information, including Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), required for EAs can lead to delays and costs. Inadequate baseline information can create problems in both EA and monitoring.

Options:

- **Clarify responsibilities for the collection and maintenance of updated information.**
 - **Coordinate government-maintained databases.**
 - **Encourage consistency of information collection, storage and access standards.**
15. Legal recognition has been given to oral testimony (traditional knowledge) as being valid in the decision-making process. In the Delgamuukw court decision, oral traditional knowledge was given equal weight to scientific knowledge.

Options:

- **Establish guidelines on how to use TEK.**
 - **Ensure resources are available for departments to contract Aboriginal communities to describe and outline how TEK can be used in EAs.**
 - **Dialogue with communities about the impacts and benefits associated with a mine.**
16. Concerns have been raised regarding the technical rigour in EA. Without sufficient quantity and quality of technical information, the effectiveness of both risk assessment and mitigation measures will be compromised.

Options:

- **Establish and communicate clear standards for technical analysis (e.g., B.C. Acid Mining Drainage Guidelines).**
- **Establish quality control mechanisms for technical information used in EA decision-making.**
- **When dealing with issues of scientific uncertainty, the precautionary principle as defined in the *Whitehorse Mining Initiative (WMI) Leadership Council Accord* should be applied.**

Cost of Decision-Making

17. **Decision-makers should create mechanisms that enable all stakeholders to participate fully, efficiently, effectively and equitably in land-use decision-making processes. Industry is concerned about the “open cheque book” approach to cost recovery.**

Options:

- **Proponent should only pay for project-specific information, and not for information required for regional land-use decision-making or general baseline data collection.**
- **The Agency should conduct a systematic program to look at the EA cost and benefits for a variety of case studies (above program will go into the five-year review).**
- **Efforts should be made to anticipate regional information requirements and to address this need in advance of project assessments wherever possible.**
- **Where the proponent collects information considered to be a public good, consideration should be given to some form of recognition or remuneration.**

Accountability

18. **Following EA approval, there is often insufficient monitoring, evaluation or compliance with established EA conditions. Without adequate follow-up systems, valuable feedback will not be available to evaluate the success of the EA process and associated mitigation measures to improve future project assessments.**

Options:

- **Establish mechanisms for follow-up, monitoring and research to evaluate the effectiveness of prescribed protection, mitigation and/or compensation measures.**
 - **Refine future EAs based on systematic feedback from monitoring and evaluation.**
 - **Protect EA process integrity through improved enforcement of conditions associated with project approval.**
 - **Take advantage of partnership opportunities associated with project developments to test the effectiveness of avoidance and mitigation measures.**
19. **Aboriginal communities are often not reported to on the status of the environment and are not involved in monitoring and enforcing compliance.**

Option:

- **Aboriginal communities affected by mining projects must be reported to by the Government on the status of projects submitted to the EA process and on the monitoring and compliance of projects approved to proceed. Mining companies should assist with this reporting requirement.**

20. In some cases, as a result of insufficient resources for monitoring and enforcement, environmental protection measures established through the EA process are not being realized. These situations contribute to increased liability and erosion of public confidence.

Options:

- **Ensure that regulatory bodies develop or have access to the appropriate resources and appropriate expertise. This should include knowledge of local Aboriginal customs and traditions.**
- **Establish and maintain monitoring and enforcement capability (e.g., technological support and training).**

THE FISHERIES ACT (SUB-SECTION 35(2)) AND THE NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT (NWPA)

Predictability of Process

21. There is a lack of consistent standards and criteria (i.e., technical guidelines).

Options:

- **Develop national standards/guidelines to provide consistency of approach for activities related to the *Fisheries Act* and the NWPA (e.g., stream crossings, roads, pipelines, etc.).**
- **These standards/guidelines should be developed in collaboration with stakeholders to cover all stages of mineral development, including exploration.**
- **They should take into account regional settings or specific species.**
- **Standards should also be provided for the types of information that are needed to meet the requirements of the guidelines (what a company might need to meet the requirements (impact on fish habitat, etc.)). Such an approach would provide the proponent with more certain means of planning and conducting its operation without causing harmful alteration to fish habitat and navigable water.**
- **Relevant guidelines, developed in consultation with other industries (for example, for the construction of pipelines and forestry roads), relevant agencies, organizations and stakeholders, should be made available as reference material (it could, for example, be cross-linked with regional baseline information databases).**

22. There is uncertainty with respect to triggering the CEAA.

(Note: This topic is also discussed under the section dealing with the CEAA.)

Options:

- **Certainty must be provided to the proponent when harmful alteration is likely to occur, and an authorization should be required to avoid the problem associated with triggering the CEAA late in the project review process.**

- It is desirable at an early stage for proponents to know if their proposal will trigger the CEAA so that they can plan for a process that integrates the work required for an authorization and an EA.
- The NWPA, or its related regulations, does not include a clear definition of “navigability,” which leaves room for interpretation and inconsistency in its implementation. The Government should amend this statute to define the term “navigability” in order to increase regulatory certainty.

23. There is inconsistent application of DFO’s *Policy for the Management of Fish Habitat* (including the No Net Loss Guidelines (e.g., Kemess South, BHP, etc.)).

Options:

- DFO should examine mechanisms (regulations, guidelines) to ensure that its policy on mitigation and compensation under the *Fisheries Act* is applied in a consistent, predictable and transparent manner nation wide.
- There should also be certainty of requirements and the process associated with the review and approval of Habitat Compensation Agreements, including the type of compensation that would be acceptable.
- Issues surrounding the concept and definition of “critical habitat” need to be clarified.

Process Coordination and Integration

24. Roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined.

Options:

- Notwithstanding the federal government’s fiduciary responsibility for Aboriginal people, responsibilities related to the *Fisheries Act* and the NWPA should be clearly defined and rest with the “best situated” jurisdiction that has the capacity to fulfil these responsibilities. Roles and responsibilities may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and be assumed by a province, a territory, the federal government, or another governing body.
- The responsibility for undertaking (or managing) the various roles may differ (e.g., databases or habitat management). Even though there may be many agencies involved, their efforts should be coordinated.
- Service delivery standards, including timelines for responding to requests, should be established (for administrative processes and provision of professional advice).
- The amount of time needed to make a decision should reflect the complexity of the problem being considered (for example, decisions required on a minor matter under the *Fisheries Act* and the NWPA should be made expeditiously, or the proponent should be given a reason why the decision has been inordinately delayed).

Availability of Relevant Information

25. There is a need for regional baseline information.

Options:

- In order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of EAs, all (interested? affected?) parties should have access to relevant environmental and other information.

- Workshop participants were divided concerning the use of the words “interested” or “affected” parties. While they recognized that access to information should be as broad as possible, some expressed concerns that the information should be made available only to affected parties in order to ensure proper intervenors’ representation during the EA process. It was also noted that the cost related to the distribution of information could be significant. One suggestion that was brought forward was to the effect that decisions could be made on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the nature of the information and the cost involved with its distribution.
- Representatives from labour and the environmental community were of the opinion that the use of “affected” was too restrictive and would hinder the environmental protection process.
- At present, information may be collected and updated by a variety of government agencies and others. There is a need to determine what information exists and how it can be accessed. In order to have access to information from various sources, it is necessary to compile and maintain an inventory of existing information and databases.
- Information should be spatially referenced (designed for GIS application). It may be provided by industry and/or governments and/or non-governmental organizations and should be adequate in order to make the necessary decisions. It should be scientifically based and include traditional knowledge where appropriate. One valuable source of information should be the feedback from ongoing monitoring activities.
- The appropriate regulatory agencies will be responsible for defining the information requirements (for example, the Valued Ecosystems Components (VECs)) for the databases.
- In order to encourage the early compilation of comprehensive data, it is recommended that information derived from environmental baseline studies be accepted as part of the required assessment work obligations (i.e., submitted for credit) under the appropriate legislation in the provinces and territories.

Accountability

26. There is a lack of accountability.

Options:

- There is a need to enhance the accountability of regulatory agencies and companies by providing a feedback mechanism to take into account the results of past decisions when making future decisions.
- Mitigation measures identified in *Fisheries Act* authorizations should be monitored and evaluated to determine whether or not these measures are achieving their objectives.
- An appeal mechanism should be developed either within the *Fisheries Act* or the CEAA to cover decisions related to *Fisheries Act* authorizations. By providing such a mechanism that could allow for a review, the accountability of officials, proponents and ministers would be enhanced.

THE METAL MINING LIQUID EFFLUENT REGULATIONS (MMLERs)

27. A basis for a cooperative national environmental protection framework regarding mine effluents has been developed but has not been fully implemented.

Options:

- **Encourage the Government to implement the Assessment of the Aquatic Effects of Mining in Canada (AQUAMIN) recommendations in a timely manner, taking into consideration the results of the Aquatic Effects Technology Evaluation (AETE) program, the *Canada-Wide Accord on Environmental Harmonization* and relevant sub-agreements, as well as federal responsibility for environmental protection.**
- **Responsibilities for delivery should be clearly defined, having regard to the public right to know in a timely manner the environmental performance of mines with respect to the MMLERs.**
- **Representatives of the environmental community found that it was difficult to deal with this issue because of the fact that there is little understanding of how the recently signed Canada-Wide Accord will affect the administration of the MMLERs.**

Conclusion

The federal-provincial-territorial review is an unprecedented opportunity to strengthen partnerships as federal, provincial and territorial governments are working together towards regulatory efficiency while maintaining high environmental standards. It also offers the opportunity to identify innovative approaches for more efficient and effective environmental regulations across Canada.

This report has been prepared by a group of representatives from the provincial, territorial and federal governments, including federal departments and the Agency responsible for the administration of the federal acts and regulations under review, the environmental community, Aboriginal groups, a labour representative from the United Steelworkers of America, legal practitioners, and industry. It contains a wealth of suggestions that have the potential to improve regulatory efficiency and the administration of environmental regulations across Canada. In many instances, it mirrors and complements the goals and principles of the *Whitehorse Mining Initiative Leadership Council Accord*, which was released in November 1994.

In conjunction with jurisdictional reports, this report will be used for the preparation of the Overview Report that will synthesize the results of the federal-provincial-territorial review to mines ministers. It will also be part of the documentation that will be submitted for consideration by mines ministers at their annual Mines Ministers' Conference in July 1998.

Stakeholder groups involved in the development of this report have indicated their interest in being involved in the preparation and implementation of future action plans that will be developed as a result of this consultation and review process.

Appendix 1: List of Participants

Tony Andrews, The Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada
Jerry Asp, Canadian Aboriginal Minerals Association
Art Ball, Department of Energy, Mines and Northern Affairs, Government of Manitoba
Ray Biette, Ministry of Natural Resources, Government of Ontario
Steve Burgess, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Colin Chambers, Canadian Environmental Network, Mining Caucus
Jim Clarke, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
Dick Cowan, Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, Government of Ontario
Alan Downe, Regulatory Reform Secretariat, Government of the Northwest Territories
Patrick Finlay, Environment Canada
John Gammon, Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, Government of Ontario
Elizabeth Gardiner, The Mining Association of Canada
Gerald Harper, Gamah International Limited
Dave Henderson, Government of Alberta
Hélène Jetté, Natural Resources Canada
Hans Matthews, Canadian Aboriginal Minerals Association
Burkhard Mausberg, Canadian Environmental Defence Fund
Rick McCabe, Atomic Energy Control Board
Garry McEwen, Department of Natural Resources and Energy, Government of New Brunswick
Ferd Morrissey, Department of Mines and Energy, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
David Pasho, Natural Resources Canada
Gordon Peeling, The Mining Association of Canada
Diana Purdy, Department of Energy, Government of Alberta
Wally Rayner, Inmet Mining Corp.
Jean Roberge, Association minière du Québec inc.
Homer Seguin, United Steelworkers of America
Don Stalker, Environment Canada
Leonard Surges, Noranda Inc.
Maxine Wiber, Rio Algom Ltd.
Mark Winfield, Canadian Institute for Environmental Law & Policy
Alan Young, Environmental Mining Council

Rob Ogilvie, Facilitator