


# Faro Mine & Tailings Worker Health and Safety Scores


10	Ideal performance. No worker fatalities, injuries, occupational exposures, or illnesses.
9	Very good performance. Insignificant problems. Minor effects only. No loss of work or hospital care needed. Between a score of 8 and 10.
8	Good performance. Minor problems. No fatalities. One serious, non-fatal, injury-causing accident.
7	Fair performance. Smallish problems. Several serious, non-fatal, injury-causing accidents.
6	Mediocre performance. Moderate problems. Small (30%) chance of a fatality. Ten or more serious, nonfatal, injury-causing accidents.
5	Poor performance. Significant problems. One fatality, arguably due to bad judgment. More than ten serious, injury-causing accidents.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. 3 fatalities. One hundred or more serious accidents.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. 10 fatalities. Hundreds of serious accidents.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Roughly 30 fatalities. Roughly a 1000 serious accidents.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Roughly 100 fatalities and thousands of serious accidents.
0	Abominable performance. A worker health and safety disaster. Exposures will result in 300 or more worker fatalities and tens of thousands of serious worker injuries.

## Short Term



NPV Total Cost

## Long Term



NPV Total Cost



Job No: 1CY001.012  
Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options

**Assessment Results  
Faro Mine & Tailings  
Worker Health & Safety Scores**

Date: January 2008

Approved:



Figure: **5.7**

# Faro Mine & Tailings Environmental Scores

## Short Term

## Long Term

10	Ideal performance. No adverse impact to any aspect of the environment, including aesthetics. The alternative fully restores and protects all water, land, air, fish and wildlife to conditions that are equal to or exceed that which existed prior to the mine. Comprehensive monitoring provides assurance.
9	Very good performance. Impacts are insignificant. No violations to environmental standards will occur. Although some minimal aesthetic affects may remain, the alternative fully restores and protects all highvalue resources. Cleanup and monitoring is best-practice.
8	Good performance. Some minor, localized, temporary impacts to environmental resources. Any violations to standards are minor; exceedences will self-correct within the year. Monitoring is adequate to allow problems to be identified and addressed in a timely fashion.
7	Fair performance. Some exceedences of applicable standards and/or localized, short-term impacts to environmental resources will occur. Effects on plants, fish, and wildlife will be mild and self-correcting within about 3 years.
6	Mediocre performance. There will be a few serious violations of applicable environmental standards. Effects on environmental resources will be significant, but localized and correctable. Regional abundance of the important species will not be seriously affected. Self-correcting in about 10 years.
5	Poor performance. Significant violations and significant problems. There will be serious but correctable damage to some highly valued ecosystem components. Regional abundance of some important species will be affected, and adverse effects will not persist for more than a generation.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. Moderate-scale, long-term, ecosystem damage. Regional abundance of important species impacted over multiple generations. Not entirely correctable.
3	Bad performance. Very serious, moderate-scale problems with irreversible (permanent) damage to some of the most highly-valued ecosystem components. Between scores of 2 and 4.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Permanent, large-scale, ecosystem damage. Regional loss of some key resources.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Loss of some ecosystem functions. Between scores of 0 and 2.
0	Abominable performance. An environmental disaster. Permanent, large-scale loss of many key species and irreparable damage to ecosystem function.



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt


Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options		
<b>Assessment Results Faro Mine &amp; Tailings Environmental Scores</b>		
Date: January 2008	Approved:	Figure: <b>5.8</b>

**Faro Mine & Tailings  
Public Health and Safety Scores**


10	Ideal performance. No health or safety problems. Although some might experience "psychological" effects, Western science and traditional knowledge will agree that there are no known physical mechanisms by which people could be harmed.
9	Very good performance. No exceedences of any health/safety-related standards will occur. Any illnesses that plausibly relate to the site will be minor and will not require medical treatment. Any injuries will be attributable to very poor judgment on the part of those harmed.
8	Good performance. Some minor violations of applicable health/safety-related standards. At worse, only a very few moderate, temporary non-life-threatening illnesses and/or injuries will occur—extreme lifestyle or habits will be a factor. Effects will be temporary and hospitalization will not be required.
7	Fair performance. The alternative will produce a few serious exceedences of applicable health/safety-related standards. There will be no deaths, but some non-life-threatening, moderately serious illnesses and/or injuries will occur. Only a small fraction of those exposed will be affected.
6	Mediocre performance. The alternative will produce moderate illnesses and injuries and a few serious injuries and/or long-term illnesses (effects lasting 5 years or more). Small (30%) chance of a fatality, but most likely not for anyone with average lifestyles and exercising reasonable judgment.
5	Poor performance. Significant problems. There will be numerous violations, serious injuries and/or illnesses, and probably one fatality to a member of the public.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. The alternative will result in a few (e.g., 3) fatalities and roughly 100 serious injuries or illnesses will occur. Not attributable to bad judgment.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. Ten or more fatalities and hundreds of serious illnesses and/or injuries.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. The alternative will result in a 30 or more fatalities to the public and as many as a thousand serious illnesses or injuries.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. One hundred or more fatalities and thousands of serious illnesses and injuries.
0	Abominable performance. A public health and safety disaster. The alternative will result in 300 or more fatalities to the public.

**Short Term**



NPV Total Cost

**Long Term**



NPV Total Cost



Job No: 1CY001.012  
Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt



Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options


**Assessment Results  
Faro Mine & Tailings  
Public Health & Safety Scores**

Date: January 2008  
Approved:  
Figure: **5.9**


**Faro Mine & Tailings  
Traditional Land Use Scores**

10	Ideal performance. No adverse impact to traditional land use. Site fully restored to natural state.
9	Very good performance. Some remaining aesthetic affects, but only insignificant and impacts on traditional land use. Necessary aquatic resources fully restored. Site allows hunting, trapping trails, trap lines essentially as existed prior to mine. Unimpeded access available at traditional trails.
8	Good performance. Some minor, localized impacts to traditional land use. Few people are effected and for only a limited amount of time.
7	Fair performance. Some moderate, highly localized, short-term limitations to traditional land use. Affects utilization of some, but not all traditional resources.
6	Mediocre performance. Some significant limitations over a small area on traditional land use remain. Between 5 and 7
5	Poor performance. Significant problems (e.g., reduction in habitat productivity) limit but do not eliminate uses essential for tradition. The impact is over a moderately sized area. Between scores of 4 and 6.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems result in significant and persistent limitations on traditional land use over a relatively large area. Affects usage of many important traditional resources. Seriously adversely affects traditions for some peoples.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. Impacts large area. Between scores of 2 and 4.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Key traditional resources lost. Permanent and major limitations on traditional land use over a very large area. Affects usage of nearly all important traditional resources for many people. Traditions lost for many peoples.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Between scores of 0 and 2.
0	Abominable performance. An disaster for traditional land use. Permanent loss of traditional land use opportunities over an extensive area and for nearly all people resulting in irreparable break with traditions.

**Short Term**



**Long Term**



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost



Job No: 1CY001.012  
Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options


**Assessment Results  
Faro Mine & Tailings  
Traditional Land Use Score**

Date: January 2008  
Approved:  
Figure: **5.10**

**Faro Mine & Tailings  
Local Land Use Scores**


10	Ideal performance. No observable adverse impact to local land use. Equal to or better than prior to the mine. Site fully restored to natural state.
9	Very good performance. Insignificant impacts. Between a score of 8 and 10.
8	Good performance. Some minor, localized impacts to local land use. Few people are effected and for only a limited amount of time.
7	Fair performance. Between a score of 6 and 8.
6	Mediocre performance. Some moderate, fairly localized, short-term limitations to local land use. Affects utilization of some, but not all relevant resources.
5	Poor performance. Significant problems. Between scores of 4 and 6.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. Significant and persistent limitations on local land use over relatively large area. Affects usage of many important local resources. Seriously adversely affects ability to enjoy the impacted land.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. Between scores of 2 and 4.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Permanent and major limitations on local land use over a very large area. Affects usage of nearly all important local resources for many people.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Between scores of 0 and 2.
0	Abominable performance. An disaster for local land use. Permanent loss of local land use opportunities across an extensive area.

**Short Term**



NPV Total Cost

**Long Term**



NPV Total Cost



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options

**Assessment Results  
 Faro Mine & Tailings  
 Local Land Use Scores**



Date: January 2008  
 Approved:  
 Figure: **5.11**

# Faro Mine & Tailings Local Socio-Economics

## Short Term

## Long Term

<b>Score</b>	<b>10</b>	Ideal. All agree substantial benefits are provided in all 4 benefit areas to Kaska & Selkirk First Nations and to Faro. No problems occur in any of the 6 indicators. There are no concerns regarding the distribution of benefits and no-one experiences difficulties associated with any eventual decline or discontinuation of benefits.
	<b>9</b>	Very good. Nearly everyone agrees that local socio-economic benefits are substantial in all 4 areas. There are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators. A few are dissatisfied either because they hoped for more benefits or because they feel there are inequities in the way benefits are distributed.
	<b>8</b>	Good. Nearly all agree that substantial benefits are provided in at least 3 of the 4 areas. Some are not satisfied, but there are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators.
	<b>7</b>	Fair. Most believe that significant benefits are provided, but many are not completely satisfied. Minor problems occur in at least one of the 6 indicators.
	<b>6</b>	Mediocre. The majority agree significant benefits are proved, and most are better off, but the majority are not satisfied and believe more should have been done. A moderate problem occurs in at least one of the 6 indicators.
	<b>5</b>	Poor. Significant benefits occur in only one of the 4 areas. Some are better off and some are worse off. On balance, there is no real improvement. A serious problem exists in at least one of the 6 indicators.
	<b>4</b>	Very poor. Nearly everyone is dissatisfied with benefits and many believe they are worse off. Some serious problems in several of the 6 components.
	<b>3</b>	Bad. Some benefits are provided but they are inadequate. Serious problems result in several of the 6 indicators and most believes they are worse off.
	<b>2</b>	Very bad. No significant local social-economic benefits are provided and major problems occur in several of the 6 indicators. Nearly everyone believes they are worse off.
	<b>1</b>	Terrible. No significant local socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas and critical problems occur in at least half of the 6 indicators. Everyone is worse off.
<b>0</b>	Abominable. No local socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas. Disastrous problems occur in the 6 indicators.	



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost

### 6 Indicators of Yukon Socio-Economics

1. Sense of well being
2. Infrastructure & services
3. Trust in government
4. Costs & income to government
5. Yukon economy
6. Income and family economics

### Benefit Areas

1. Training and skill development.
2. Job & business opportunities.
3. Tourism & educational opportunities.
4. Other



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

### Closure Options

## Assessment Results Faro Mine & Tailings Local Socio-Economics Scores



Date: January 2008  
 Approved:  
 Figure: **5.12**

**Faro Mine & Tailings  
Yukon Socio-Economics Scores**

**Short Term**

**Long Term**

10	Ideal. All agree substantial benefits are provided in all 4 benefit areas to the Yukon (excluding locals). No problems occur in any of the 6 indicators. There are no concerns regarding the distribution of benefits and no-one experiences difficulties associated with any eventual decline or discontinuation of benefits.
9	Very good. Nearly everyone agrees that Yukon socio-economic benefits are substantial in all 4 areas. There are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators. A few are dissatisfied either because they hoped for more benefits or because they feel there are inequities in the way benefits are distributed.
8	Good. Nearly all agree that substantial benefits are provided in at least 3 of the 4 areas. Some are not satisfied, but there are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators..
7	Fair. Most believe that significant benefits are provided, but many are not completely satisfied. Minor problems occur in at least one of the 6 indicators.
6	Mediocre. The majority agree significant benefits are proved, and most are better off, but the majority are not satisfied and believe more should have been done. A moderate problem occurs in at least one of the 6 indicators.
5	Poor. Significant benefits occur in only one of the 4 areas. Some are better off and some are worse off. On balance, there is no real improvement. A serious problem exists in at least one of the 6 indicators.
4	Very poor. Nearly everyone is dissatisfied with benefits and many believe they are worse off. Some serious problems in several of the 6 components.
3	Bad. Some benefits are provided but they are inadequate. Serious problems result in several of the 6 indicators and most believes they are worse off.
2	Very bad. No significant Yukon social-economic benefits are provided and major problems occur in several of the 6 indicators. Nearly everyone believes they are worse off.
1	Terrible. No significant Yukon socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas and critical problems occur in at least half of the 6 indicators. Everyone is worse off.
0	Abominable. No Yukon socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas. Disastrous problems occur in the 6 indicators.



**NPV Total Cost**

**NPV Total Cost**

**6 Indicators of Yukon Socio-Economics**

1. Sense of well being
2. Infrastructure & services
3. Trust in government
4. Costs & income to government
5. Yukon economy
6. Income and family economics

**Benefit Areas**

1. Training and skill development.
2. Job & business opportunities.
3. Tourism & educational opportunities.
4. Other



Closure Options

**Assessment Results  
Faro Mine & Tailings  
Yukon Socio-Economics Scores**

Job No: 1CY001.012  
Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt



Faro Mine Complex

Date: January 2008

Approved:

Figure: **5.13**

**Faro Mine & Tailings  
Cost Scores**



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Mine-Tailings\_20080214.ppt


Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options		
<b>Assessment Results Faro Mine &amp; Tailings Cost Scores</b>		
Date: January 2008	Approved:	Figure: <b>5.14</b>


**Vangorda/Grum  
Worker Health and Safety Scores**

10	Ideal performance. No worker fatalities, injuries, occupational exposures, or illnesses.
9	Very good performance. Insignificant problems. Minor effects only. No loss of work or hospital care needed. Between a score of 8 and 10.
8	Good performance. Minor problems. No fatalities. One serious, non-fatal, injury-causing accident.
7	Fair performance. Smallish problems. Several serious, non-fatal, injury-causing accidents.
6	Mediocre performance. Moderate problems. Small (30%) chance of a fatality. Ten or more serious, nonfatal, injury-causing accidents.
5	Poor performance. Significant problems. One fatality, arguably due to bad judgment. More than ten serious, injury-causing accidents.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. 3 fatalities. One hundred or more serious accidents.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. 10 fatalities. Hundreds of serious accidents.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Roughly 30 fatalities. Roughly a 1000 serious accidents.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Roughly 100 fatalities and thousands of serious accidents
0	Abominable performance. A worker health and safety disaster. Exposures will result in 300 or more worker fatalities and tens of thousands of serious worker injuries.

**Short Term**



**Long Term**



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex



Closure Options		
<b>Assessment Results Vangorda/Grum Worker Health &amp; Safety Scores</b>		
Date: January 2008	Approved:	Figure: <b>5.15</b>

**Vangorda/Grum  
Environmental Scores**

**Short Term**

**Long Term**

10	Ideal performance. No adverse impact to any aspect of the environment, including aesthetics. The alternative fully restores and protects all water, land, air, fish and wildlife to conditions that are equal to or exceed that which existed prior to the mine. Comprehensive monitoring provides assurance.
9	Very good performance. Impacts are insignificant. No violations to environmental standards will occur. Although some minimal aesthetic affects may remain, the alternative fully restores and protects all highvalue resources. Cleanup and monitoring is best-practice.
8	Good performance. Some minor, localized, temporary impacts to environmental resources. Any violations to standards are minor; exceedences will self-correct within the year. Monitoring is adequate to allow problems to be identified and addressed in a timely fashion.
7	Fair performance. Some exceedences of applicable standards and/or localized, short-term impacts to environmental resources will occur. Effects on plants, fish, and wildlife will be mild and self-correcting within about 3 years.
6	Mediocre performance. There will be a few serious violations of applicable environmental standards. Effects on environmental resources will be significant, but localized and correctable. Regional abundance of the important species will not be seriously affected. Self-correcting in about 10 years.
5	Poor performance. Significant violations and significant problems. There will be serious but correctable damage to some highly valued ecosystem components. Regional abundance of some important species will be affected, and adverse effects will not persist for more than a generation.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. Moderate-scale, long-term, ecosystem damage. Regional abundance of important species impacted over multiple generations. Not entirely correctable.
3	Bad performance. Very serious, moderate-scale problems with irreversible (permanent) damage to some of the most highly-valued ecosystem components. Between scores of 2 and 4.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Permanent, large-scale, ecosystem damage. Regional loss of some key resources.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Loss of some ecosystem functions. Between scores of 0 and 2.
0	Abominable performance. An environmental disaster. Permanent, large-scale loss of many key species and irreparable damage to ecosystem function.



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost


**SRK Consulting**  
 Engineers and Scientists  
 VANCOUVER

Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt


**Faro Mine Closure**  
 Fermeture de la mine Faro

Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options  
**Assessment Results**  
**Vangorda/Grum**  
**Environmental Scores**

Date: January 2008	Approved:	Figure: <b>5.16</b>
--------------------	-----------	---------------------


Vangorda/Grum

Public Health and Safety Scores


Score

10	Ideal performance. No health or safety problems. Although some might experience "psychological" effects, Western science and traditional knowledge will agree that there are no known physical mechanisms by which people could be harmed.
9	Very good performance. No exceedences of any health/safety-related standards will occur. Any illnesses that plausibly relate to the site will be minor and will not require medical treatment. Any injuries will be attributable to very poor judgment on the part of those harmed.
8	Good performance. Some minor violations of applicable health/safety-related standards. At worst, only a very few moderate, temporary non-life-threatening illnesses and/or injuries will occur—extreme lifestyle or habits will be a factor. Effects will be temporary and hospitalization will not be required.
7	Fair performance. The alternative will produce a few serious exceedences of applicable health/safety-related standards. There will be no deaths, but some non-life-threatening, moderately serious illnesses and/or injuries will occur. Only a small fraction of those exposed will be affected.
6	Mediocre performance. The alternative will produce moderate illnesses and injuries and a few serious injuries and/or long-term illnesses (effects lasting 5 years or more). Small (30%) chance of a fatality, but most likely not for anyone with average lifestyles and exercising reasonable judgment.
5	Poor performance. Significant problems. There will be numerous violations, serious injuries and/or illnesses, and probably one fatality to a member of the public.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. The alternative will result in a few (e.g., 3) fatalities and roughly 100 serious injuries or illnesses will occur. Not attributable to bad judgment.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. Ten or more fatalities and hundreds of serious illnesses and/or injuries.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. The alternative will result in a 30 or more fatalities to the public and as many as a thousand serious illnesses or injuries.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. One hundred or more fatalities and thousands of serious illnesses and injuries.
0	Abominable performance. A public health and safety disaster. The alternative will result in 300 or more fatalities to the public.

Short Term



Long Term



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options  
**Assessment Results**  
**Vangorda/Grum**  
**Public Health & Safety Scores**



Date: January 2008  
 Approved:  
 Figure: **5.17**

**Vangorda/Grum  
Traditional Land Use Scores**

**Short Term**

**Long Term**

10	Ideal performance. No adverse impact to traditional land use. Site fully restored to natural state.
9	Very good performance. Some remaining aesthetic affects, but only insignificant and impacts on traditional land use. Necessary aquatic resources fully restored. Site allows hunting, trapping trails, trap lines essentially as existed prior to mine. Unimpeded access available at traditional trails.
8	Good performance. Some minor, localized impacts to traditional land use. Few people are effected and for only a limited amount of time.
7	Fair performance. Some moderate, highly localized, short-term limitations to traditional land use. Affects utilization of some, but not all traditional resources.
6	Mediocre performance. Some significant limitations over a small area on traditional land use remain. Between 5 and 7.
5	Poor performance. Significant problems (e.g., reduction in habitat productivity) limit but do not eliminate uses essential for tradition. The impact is over a moderately sized area. Between scores of 4 and 6.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems result in significant and persistent limitations on traditional land use over a relatively large area. Affects usage of many important traditional resources. Seriously adversely affects traditions for some peoples.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. Impacts large area. Between scores of 2 and 4.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Key traditional resources lost. Permanent and major limitations on traditional land use over a very large area. Affects usage of nearly all important traditional resources for many people. Traditions lost for many peoples.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Between scores of 0 and 2.
0	Abominable performance. An disaster for traditional land use. Permanent loss of traditional land use opportunities over an extensive area and for nearly all people resulting in irreparable break with traditions.



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost


**SRK Consulting**  
 Engineers and Scientists  
 VANCOUVER

Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt


**Faro Mine Closure**  
 Fermeture de la mine Faro

Faro Mine Complex


Closure Options  
**Assessment Results**  
**Vangorda/Grum**  
**Traditional Land Use Score**

Date: January 2008	Approved:	Figure: <b>5.18</b>
--------------------	-----------	---------------------

**Vangorda/Grum  
Local Land Use Scores**


10	Ideal performance. No observable adverse impact to local land use. Equal to or better than prior to the mine. Site fully restored to natural state.
9	Very good performance. Insignificant impacts. Between a score of 8 and 10.
8	Good performance. Some minor, localized impacts to local land use. Few people are effected and for only a limited amount of time.
7	Fair performance. Between a score of 6 and 8.
6	Mediocre performance. Some moderate, fairly localized, short-term limitations to local land use. Affects utilization of some, but not all relevant resources.
5	Poor performance. Significant problems. Between scores of 4 and 6.
4	Very poor performance. Serious problems. Significant and persistent limitations on local land use over relatively large area. Affects usage of many important local resources. Seriously adversely affects ability to enjoy the impacted land.
3	Bad performance. Very serious problems. Between scores of 2 and 4.
2	Very bad performance. Major problems. Permanent and major limitations on local land use over a very large area. Affects usage of nearly all important local resources for many people.
1	Terrible performance. Critical problem. Between scores of 0 and 2.
0	Abominable performance. An disaster for local land use. Permanent loss of local land use opportunities across an extensive area.

**Short Term**



NPV Total Cost

**Long Term**



NPV Total Cost



Closure Options  
**Assessment Results  
Vangorda/Grum  
Local Land Use Scores**

Job No: 1CY001.012  
Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

Date: January 2008


Approved:

Figure: **5.19**


**Vangorda/Grum  
Local Socio-Economics**

<b>10</b>	Ideal. All agree substantial benefits are provided in all 4 benefit areas to Kaska & Selkirk First Nations and to Faro. No problems occur in any of the 6 indicators. There are no concerns regarding the distribution of benefits and no-one experiences difficulties associated with any eventual decline or discontinuation of benefits.
<b>9</b>	Very good. Nearly everyone agrees that local socio-economic benefits are substantial in all 4 areas. There are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators. A few are dissatisfied either because they hoped for more benefits or because they feel there are inequities in the way benefits are distributed.
<b>8</b>	Good. Nearly all agree that substantial benefits are provided in at least 3 of the 4 areas. Some are not satisfied, but there are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators..
<b>7</b>	Fair. Most believe that significant benefits are provided, but many are not completely satisfied. Minor problems occur in at least one of the 6 indicators.
<b>6</b>	Mediocre. The majority agree significant benefits are proved, and most are better off, but the majority are not satisfied and believe more should have been done. A moderate problem occurs in at least one of the 6 indicators.
<b>5</b>	Poor. Significant benefits occur in only one of the 4 areas. Some are better off and some are worse off. On balance, there is no real improvement. A serious problem exists in at least one of the 6 indicators.
<b>4</b>	Very poor. Nearly everyone is dissatisfied with benefits and many believe they are worse off. Some serious problems in several of the 6 components.
<b>3</b>	Bad. Some benefits are provided but they are inadequate. Serious problems result in several of the 6 indicators and most believes they are worse off.
<b>2</b>	Very bad. No significant local social-economic benefits are provided and major problems occur in several of the 6 indicators. Nearly everyone believes they are worse off.
<b>1</b>	Terrible. No significant local socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas and critical problems occur in at least half of the 6 indicators. Everyone is worse off.
<b>0</b>	Abominable. No local socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas. Disastrous problems occur in the 6 indicators.

**Short Term**



**Long Term**



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost

**6 Indicators of Yukon Socio-Economics**

1. Sense of well being
2. Infrastructure & services
3. Trust in government
4. Costs & income to government
5. Yukon economy
6. Income and family economics

**Benefit Areas**

1. Training and skill development.
2. Job & business opportunities.
3. Tourism & educational opportunities.
4. Other



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

Closure Options

**Assessment Results  
Vangorda/Grum  
Local Socio-Economics Scores**

Date: January 2008      Approved:      Figure: **5.20**



Vangorda/Grum

Yukon Socio-Economics Scores

Short Term

Long Term

10	Ideal. All agree substantial benefits are provided in all 4 benefit areas to the Yukon (excluding locals). No problems occur in any of the 6 indicators. There are no concerns regarding the distribution of benefits and no-one experiences difficulties associated with any eventual decline or discontinuation of benefits.
9	Very good. Nearly everyone agrees that Yukon socio-economic benefits are substantial in all 4 areas. There are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators. A few are dissatisfied either because they hoped for more benefits or because they feel there are inequities in the way benefits are distributed.
8	Good. Nearly all agree that substantial benefits are provided in at least 3 of the 4 areas. Some are not satisfied, but there are no significant problems in any of the 6 indicators..
7	Fair. Most believe that significant benefits are provided, but many are not completely satisfied. Minor problems occur in at least one of the 6 indicators.
6	Mediocre. The majority agree significant benefits are proved, and most are better off, but the majority are not satisfied and believe more should have been done. A moderate problem occurs in at least one of the 6 indicators.
5	Poor. Significant benefits occur in only one of the 4 areas. Some are better off and some are worse off. On balance, there is no real improvement. A serious problem exists in at least one of the 6 indicators.
4	Very poor. Nearly everyone is dissatisfied with benefits and many believe they are worse off. Some serious problems in several of the 6 components.
3	Bad. Some benefits are provided but they are inadequate. Serious problems result in several of the 6 indicators and most believes they are worse off.
2	Very bad. No significant Yukon social-economic benefits are provided and major problems occur in several of the 6 indicators. Nearly everyone believes they are worse off.
1	Terrible. No significant Yukon socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas and critical problems occur in at least half of the 6 indicators. Everyone is worse off.
0	Abominable. No Yukon socio-economic benefits are provided in any of the 4 areas. Disastrous problems occur in the 6 indicators



NPV Total Cost

NPV Total Cost

6 Indicators of Yukon Socio-Economics

1. Sense of well being
2. Infrastructure & services
3. Trust in government
4. Costs & income to government
5. Yukon economy
6. Income and family economics

Benefit Areas

1. Training and skill development.
2. Job & business opportunities.
3. Tourism & educational opportunities.
4. Other



Job No: 1CY001.012  
 Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex


Closure Options  
**Assessment Results**  
**Vangorda/Grum**  
**Yukon Socio-Economics Scores**

Date: January 2008

Approved:

Figure: **5.21**

**Vangorda/Grum  
Cost Scores**



Closure Options  
**Assessment Results  
Vangorda/Grum  
Cost Scores**

Job No: 1CY001.012  
Filename: Figures\_Vangorda-Grum\_20080214.ppt

Faro Mine Complex

Date: January 2008

Approved:

Figure: **5.22**