The Conditions for Development outlined in the HV1-C Gundy Complex Plan ([Order in Council 532/2024 (gov.bc.ca)](https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/oic/oic_cur/0532_2024)) align with the Province of British Columbia’s (B.C.) professional reliance model, by which government relies on qualified professionals to provide sound and impartial advice and recommendations for the purpose of informing decisions in relation to resource management and environmental protection in B.C. The tables below must be included with the **QP/QEP Assessment Report as a cover page** to demonstrate that the professional reliance model has been followed, and that the activities are in concordance with the HV1-C Gundy Complex Plan.

1. Qualified Professionals (QPs) and Qualified Environmental Professionals (QEPs) credentials, experience and sign-off.

The table below must be used to describe the QP/QEPs name(s), credentials, years experience in the field specific to the discipline.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Personnel, Credentials, and Discipline** | **Years Experience specific to the discipline** | **Signature** |
| *e.g., Joanna Smith, M.Sc., R.P.Bio – Ecosystems and Wildlife* | *e.g., Eight years of experience related to ecosystem and wildlife assessment, including more than 5 years working with proponents in the oil and gas sector.* | *Add signature* |

1. Concordance with the Conditions for Development for Oil and Gas Activity:

Where the conditions for development cannot be met or are not applicable indicate “no” under “Condition met”. A rationale must be provided where the condition for development cannot be met as a summary statement following the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Condition for Development** | **Condition met**  **(yes or no)** |
| **General** | |
| Has the permit-holder demonstrated the operational measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the cumulative effects on the Values and land users that may be exercising Treaty Rights in the area? |  |
| Have activities been planned and carried out in a manner that will not undermine the Values? |  |
| **Have the following been included in the QP/QEP Assessment:** | |
| An explanation of the necessity of the proposed activity. |  |
| An estimate of equipment and personnel that will be mobilized, the timing and duration of works and construction. |  |
| The proximity of the proposed development to known Values, which includes Old Forest & contiguous diverse ecosystems, moose & moose habitat, water, aquatic ecosystems & riparian areas, habitat for grizzly & other fur-bearers, and peaceful enjoyment of land and culturally important areas. |  |
| For activities that will involve New Disturbance, a summary of temporary and long-term changes to the landscape and surroundings including, but not limited to any infrastructure that will be installed, vegetation removal, water use, soil disturbance, changes to viewsheds or soundscapes, and any anticipated changes to access to the local area by land users. |  |
| Identification, rationale, and status of ecological recovery (if applicable) for the Zone of Influence associated with the proposed activity. |  |
| Photographs, as applicable and particularly where physical site conditions differed from expected. |  |
| **Site-Specific Mitigation Strategy Triggers:** | |
| Impacts to Old Forest and/or Recruitment Forest. Proponents must demonstrate how impacts to Old Forest (140+) and Recruitment Forest (120+) have been minimized, considering the characteristics of the Old Forest/Recruitment Forest that will be impacted. |  |
| Impacts to critical habitat for federally listed Species at Risk, or habitat that has a reasonable likelihood of supporting provincially listed Species at Risk and/or Endangered/threatened ecosystems, as identified in the BC Conservation Data Centre. |  |
| Impacts to aquatic habitat (e.g., watercourses and wetlands) as allowable by these conditions, except to facilitate a low risk crossing as defined in Section 7.6.1 of the Gundy Complex HV1-C Plan. |  |
| Impacts to a Riparian Management Area (as defined in Figure 6 of the Gundy Complex HV1-C Plan), except to facilitate a low risk crossing (see Section 6.7.1 of the Gundy Complex Hv1-C Plan). |  |
| New wellpad within a Riparian Management Area (as defined in Figure 6 of the Gundy HV1-C Plan). |  |
| Impact high suitability/capability moose habitat and/or fisher habitat. |  |
| Carrying out Oil and Gas activities in high or moderate value moose habitat that may disrupt moose during the caution or critical moose timing window. |  |
| **Operational rules** | |
| Does the proposed project and associated activities adhere to the minimum expected widths for the Riparian Management Zone (RMZ), Riparian Reserve Zone (RRZ), and Riparian Management Area (RMA) identified in Table 2 of the Gundy Complex HV1-C Plan? |  |
| Does the proposed project and associated activities adhere to the following minimum setbacks:   * 1 km setback from known/identified First Nations’ cabins as established. * 500m setback from First Nations’ campsites, spiritual and medicinal plant sites * 250m setback from mineral licks or wallows and established cultural trails. * 1 km setback from First Nations burial sites for all activities. |  |
| If the proposed project occurs within 250m of the Protection Zone, have the following impacts been addressed:   * Windthrow hazard. * Introducing deleterious materials or invasive species. * Changes in viewscapes and soundscapes. * Change in hydrological flows. * Increased erosion and slope instability. |  |
| Has the timing of the project considered impacts to land users? |  |
| Are activities with the potential to increase stress on moose planned to occur outside of the critical activity period, between May 15 and July 15? |  |
| **Have the following practices been incorporated for the following activities to mitigate unique impacts to the Values?** | |
| **Pipelines:** | |
| Incorporate the best available line-of-sight mitigations along linear developments at least every 200 m (or more frequently if the case specific circumstances warrant) and where linear disturbances intersect roads, seismic lines, and electrical transmission lines. |  |
| Demonstrate Best Efforts to reduce the width of existing corridors for the full linear length where proposed activities overlap existing rights-of-way. |  |
| Adopt water and wildlife movement-friendly designs, including, but not limited to avoiding hardscaping (e.g., concrete, asphalt, pavement) when permeable materials suffice (e.g., nature-based solutions), integrate small mammal and amphibian crossing structures into right of way post-construction remediation, integrate beaver deceivers, and ensure ditches and barrows will not entrap wildlife. |  |
| Above-ground appurtenances must not be located within an RMZ. Riser sites and pigging facilities must not be located within wetlands. |  |
| **Geophysical Activities:** | |
| Line of sight and access mitigations, including meandering avoidance, tree bending, boulder placement, dog legs and other mitigations as appropriate, must be implemented at minimum at:   * Intersection points of seismic lines and roads. * Intersection points of seismic lines and pipelines. * Intersection points of seismic lines and electrical transmission lines. * At regular intervals along the seismic lines. |  |
| Industry standard best practices for low impact seismic techniques. |  |
| Vegetation should be hand trimmed and compressed under equipment to support regeneration after completion of works and mulch should not exceed 4 cm in depth. |  |
| Avoid intersections with access routes wherever possible. |  |
| Source lines must avoid the RMA established for all streams, lakes, wetlands where operationally feasible. Where source lines are proposed within RMZ they must be appropriately justified. Source lines within the RMZ must avoid trees to the extent feasible and use a meandering path to avoid creating lines of sight. Source lines must avoid the RRZ. |  |
| Receiver lines within the RMA must have demonstrated need, be hand cut, avoid trees (>20 cm dbh), and use a meandering path to avoid creating lines of sight. |  |
| In addition to the restoration requirements within 7.5(4) of the Gundy Complex HV1-C Plan the restoration plan for seismic lines must include:   * Recovery of exposed soils within one growing season. * Vegetation re-growth to the lesser of the height of the surrounding vegetation (e.g., in shrub habitat) or moose height (2 m) within five years. If this is not achievable given the vegetation present pre-disturbance, the QEP/QP will provide an alternative performance indicator suitable for the location. * Commitment to implement within one growing season of seismic activities. * Success monitoring and maintenance plan to monitor the effectiveness over five growing seasons. * Where the restoration monitoring effectiveness identifies deficiencies, adaptive management including additional restoration strategies must commence within one growing season of final activities or the identification of need, whichever is sooner. |  |
| **Borrow Pits:** | |
| Construction of borrow pits that do not hold water is encouraged. Where pits do contain water, restoration activities with a priority of naturalizing the borrow pit must begin within one growing season of the last use of the pit for fill material. |  |
| Borrow pits must not be located such that there is hydrological connectivity with streams, lakes or wetlands and must be constructed to ensure no compromise to or interference with slope stability or drainage patterns. |  |
| As soon as practicable following the use of the borrow pit to support operations, steps must be taken to recontour the borrow pit and, where feasible, refill with appropriate soil materials. |  |
| **Have the following practices been incorporated in design and planning Where a new linear development is proposed in high value moose habitat?** | |
| Implement measures to facilitate unimpeded wildlife movement across the linear development at least every 500m. |  |
| Improve landscape permeability to moose with respect to pipelines and other ROWs include:   * Burying infrastructure and revegetating with a native plant assemblage that provides visual shelter. * Installing a wildlife overpass structure where above-ground pipelines or other infrastructure may impede moose passage across the right of way for more than 250 metres. * Elevate above-ground pipelines at least 180 cm from the ground to allow for moose passage underneath. |  |
| Measures to reduce the potential for moose-vehicle collisions on roads must also be implemented. These include:   * Monitoring to produce hot spot mapping for moose crossings and enhancing safe passage conditions at these locations. * Establishing forage on roadsides with less palatable species and altering dates and times of ditch cutting. * Reducing any roadside mineral licks that attract moose to roadsides – moving them or creating mineral licks off road. * Motion detection wildlife crossing signs. * Reduced speed limits. |  |

Where conditions for development have not been met, include a rationale: