



Prairie and Northern Region
Canada Place
Suite 1145, 9700 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 4C3

Région des Prairies et du Nord
Place Canada
Pièce 1145, 9700 rue Jasper
Edmonton (Alberta) T5J 4C3

January 22, 2021

Colin Webster
Vice President, Sustainability and External Affairs
Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street, Suite 3910
Toronto, ON M5J 2T3
CWebster@alamosgold.com

Dear Mr. Colin Webster:

SUBJECT: Technical Review of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Lynn Lake Gold Project – Information Request (IR) Round 1 Package 3

The Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (the Agency), with input from federal authorities, Indigenous groups, and the public, is continuing the technical review of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Lynn Lake Gold Project (the Project) received from Alamos Gold Inc. on July 27, 2020.

Upon review of the EIS, the Agency, federal authorities, and Indigenous Groups identified gaps in the information provided. The information is necessary to determine whether the Project is likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects and to inform the Agency's preparation of the Environmental Assessment (EA) Report under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012* (CEAA 2012).

The Agency sent Alamos Gold Inc. Round 1 Package 1 on October 28, 2020, and Package 2 on December 22, 2020. The Agency has prepared the attached IR Round 1 Package 3. Should Alamos Gold Inc. reassess the responses provided for Package 1 due to the issuance of Package 3, please provide any updated responses to the Agency, as required.



When responding to IRs, the Agency requests that Alamos Gold Inc.:

- consider the context and rationale for the required information for every question;
- present thorough discussions of any areas of uncertainty, applying a precautionary approach, given that some studies and plans may not be complete at this time;
- where uncertainty remains, provide clearly defined, detailed follow-up program measures, including proposed further mitigation measures; and
- present complete or summarized information and discussion within the IR responses, rather than limited responses to references to applicable reports.

The Government of Canada is integrating consultation with Indigenous peoples into the EA process for the Lynn Lake Gold Project, to the extent possible, to fulfill its duty to consult, and where appropriate, accommodate. As noted in the EIS Guidelines, the Crown will rely on information collected for the purposes of the EA to fulfill its duty to consult and inform its assessment of potential impacts on the exercise of Aboriginal or treaty rights. The Agency requests that Alamos Gold Inc. engage with each Indigenous group identified in the EIS Guidelines and in subsequent correspondence to gather the required information and discuss outstanding concerns. The Agency encourages Alamos Gold Inc. to support and facilitate the participation of Indigenous groups in this review process.

For responses to all information request items related to effects of changes to the environment on Indigenous peoples (CEAA 2012 section 5(1)(c)) and potential impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights, the Agency requests that Alamos Gold Inc. present the input obtained from Indigenous Groups, including a description of how that input was integrated into the responses. Points of disagreement between the views of Alamos Gold Inc. and Indigenous groups, processes to reconcile differences, and a rationale for conclusions should be presented.

The Agency understands that Alamos Gold Inc. committed, in August 2020, to submit an update on the status of its engagement with Indigenous groups in January 2021 that will include updates on engagement activities, traditional land and resource use studies, and impacts rights assessments.

In accordance with CEAA 2012, time taken by Alamos Gold Inc. to provide the required information is not included in the legal timeframe within which the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change must make an EA decision. Issuance of this IR Package continues to keep the timeline paused at day 130 of 365.

The Agency welcomes the opportunity to discuss the outcome of this review with you and provide further advice on how to best address the information required

to move forward with the assessment process. If you have any questions, please contact me at Melissa.Pinto@canada.ca or 587-338-7191.

Sincerely,

<original signed by>

Melissa Pinto, Project Manager

Enclosure(s):

Lynn Lake Gold Project - Technical Review Information Requests Round 1,
Package 3

c.c.: Chris Bostwick, Vice President Technical Services, Alamos Gold Inc.
Michael Raess, Senior Environmental and Community Relations
Coordinator, Alamos Gold Inc.
Karen Mathers, Project Manager, Stantec Consulting Ltd.

**Lynn Lake Gold Project - Technical Review Information Requests Round 1, Package 3
January 2021**

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym or Abbreviation	Definition
CCN	Chemawawin Cree Nation
CEAA 2012	<i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i>
COPC	Chemical of Potential Concern
COSEWIC	Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada
DFO	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
DPM	Diesel Particulate Matter
EA	Environmental Assessment
ECCC	Environment and Climate Change Canada
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
HC	Health Canada
HCN	Hydrogen Cyanide
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
HQ	Hazard Quotient
IAAC	Impact Assessment Agency of Canada
KMU	Kamuchawie Management Unit
LAA	Local Assessment Area
MBCA	<i>Migratory Birds Convention Act</i>
MCCN	Mathias Colomb Cree Nation
MBWCMC	Manitoba's Boreal Woodland Caribou Recovery Strategy
MMF	Manitoba Metis Federation
MMTKLUO	Manitoba Metis Traditional Knowledge, Land Use and Occupancy Study
MSD	Manitoba Sustainable Development
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon
PDA	Project Development Area
POPC	Parameters of Potential Concern
PR 391	Provincial Road 391
RAA	Regional Assessment Area
RQ	Risk Quotient
SAR	Species at Risk
SARA	<i>Species at Risk Act</i>
SDFN	Sayisi Dene First Nation
SOCC	Species of Conservation Concern
SR	Screening Ratio
TC	Transport Canada
the Project	Lynn Lake Gold Project
TLRU	Traditional Land and Resource Use
TMF	Tailings Management Facility
TRV	Toxicological Reference Value
VC	Valued Component
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

**Lynn Lake Gold Project – Technical Review Information Requests Round 1, Package 3
January 2021**

Reference IR#	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	EIS Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Requests
Vegetation and Wetlands					
IAAC-146	MCCN-51	3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries	8.4.2.3 Project Residual Effects 11.1.4.1 Spatial Boundaries	<p>The EIS Guidelines state that spatial and temporal boundaries are to be defined and a rationale provided, taking into account the appropriate scale and spatial extent of potential environmental effects; community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge; current or TLRU by Indigenous Groups; and ecological, technical, social, and cultural considerations. The EIS Guidelines also require that landscape disturbance to wetlands be described.</p> <p>The EIS states that for vegetation and wetlands, the PDA includes a 30 m buffer to account for direct Project effects, and the LAA includes a 1 km buffer around the PDA and PR 391 access road to account for indirect effects.</p> <p>Open pit mines can affect the composition and quality of vegetation and wetland communities beyond a 1 km buffer area. Dewatering needed to empty the open pit during construction for mine operation, for example, is expected to lower water levels by 1 m within 1.2 km of the open pit, with implications for wetland function and species composition. It is unclear how the selected spatial boundaries accounted for these direct and indirect effects to wetlands and vegetation. All direct and indirect effects need to be considered in the selection of the PDA and the LAA spatial boundaries.</p> <p>Furthermore, the spatial boundaries provided do not describe how Indigenous perspectives on the spatial extent of effects from open pit mines to vegetation and wetlands were captured. The EIS does not provide an explanation on how the selection of spatial boundaries considered Indigenous rights.</p> <p>The EIS does not provide rationale and description of how PDA, LAA, and RAA boundaries were determined to account for direct and indirect effects to vegetation and wetlands in consideration of ecological, social, and</p>	<p>a. Describe the spatial extent of the direct and indirect effects to vegetation and wetlands and how spatial boundaries account for the full potential scope of effects.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Clarify how a 1 km buffer area was selected for the LAA, considering that indirect effects to vegetation and wetlands are anticipated to extend beyond this area.</p> <p>b. Clarify and describe how the selection of the spatial boundaries for vegetation and wetlands considered Indigenous knowledge and community knowledge, and how potential impacts to rights were considered in the selection of the spatial boundaries.</p> <p>c. Describe whether any boundaries need to be updated based on the information provided in parts a and b. If boundaries are updated, provided an updated effects assessment and identify any changes to the conclusions. Describe any mitigation measures, monitoring, and follow-up as necessary.</p>

				cultural factors. Additional information on how the spatial boundaries used in the assessment for wetlands and vegetation took into consideration potential Project effects and Indigenous and community knowledge is required to fully understand Project effects to wetlands and vegetation.	
IAAC-147	MCCN-52	6.1.4 Riparian, Wetland, and Terrestrial Environments 6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments	11.4.6 Project Residual Effects Tables 11-7 and 11-8	<p>The EIS Guidelines require characterization of the shoreline, banks, current and future flood risk areas, and wetlands (fens, marshes, peatlands, mudflats, and eelgrass beds, etc.), including the location and extent of wetlands likely to be affected by Project activities according to their size, type (class and form), the description of their ecological function (ecological, hydrological, wildlife, socioeconomic, etc.), and species composition. The EIS Guidelines also require the EIS to describe changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>Direct effects to wetland classes during construction and operation are summarized in Tables 11-7 and 11-8 however, it is unclear how the spatial extent of indirect effects that extend beyond the LAA have been quantified and assessed. While indirect effects, such as changes in groundwater height, dust from mine operation and vehicles, thawing of permafrost, etc., are discussed in Section 11.4.6, it is unclear what area and proportion of wetland habitats will be affected by indirect effects across all Project phases. Clarity is needed around how the indirect effects to wetlands were assessed across all Project phases, including decommissioning and closure.</p> <p>Understanding the full extent of direct and indirect effects to unique habitat types is important for evaluating potential Project effects to habitat availability and function, including effects to the quantity and quality of culturally important plants and wildlife associated with these ecosystems. For example, indirect effects to vegetation and wetlands can have effects on Indigenous harvesting practices (e.g., due to changes in species composition, or a loss of confidence in the quality of wild foods) and must be quantified.</p> <p>This information and clarity are required to fully understand Project effects to wetlands and vegetation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide a discussion and tabular summary for each wetland class of the area and percent of area potentially affected by indirect Project effects within the LAA and RAA during Project construction, operation, decommissioning and closure phases. b. Clarify the definition of indirect losses and the difference from direct losses for vegetation and wetlands. c. Provide a tabular summary of the cumulative area potentially affected by direct and indirect effects to vegetation and wetlands within the LAA and RAA during Project construction, operation, decommissioning and closure. Include a summary of all direct and indirect losses and effects, and provide an overview of the total area potentially affected directly and indirectly by the Project.
IAAC-148	DFO-7	6.1.6 Fish and fish habitat	11.2.2 Overview 11.4.2.3 Project Residual Effects	The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to characterize the spatial extent of the surface area of potential or confirmed fish habitat for spawning, rearing, nursery, feeding, overwintering, and migration routes. The EIS Guidelines require a description of primary and secondary productivity of aquatic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirm whether the wetlands identified in the LAA support fish and/or fish habitat. If fish and/or fish habitat are present, provide a full description and assessment, including:

		<p>6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments</p> <p>6.3.1 Fish and fish habitat</p>		<p>resources (e.g., benthic communities, feeder species, and aquatic plants) in terms of abundance and distribution in affected water bodies with a characterisation of season variability. The EIS Guidelines state that certain intermittent streams or wetlands may constitute fish habitat or contribute indirectly to fish habitat, and that an absence of fish at the time of the survey does not irrefutably indicate an absence of fish habitat.</p> <p>The EIS states that effects to wetland functions at both the Gordon and MacLellan sites “are predicted to be continuous, moderate in magnitude, long-term in duration, restricted to the LAA, and reversible/ irreversible”. The EIS also states that “Of the wetland area in the LAA, 81% is organic wetland (bogs and fens); the remaining area is mineral wetland (marshes and swamps; Table 11-3)”. As described, the wetlands identified within the LAA have the potential to provide habitat for fish. These effects have not been identified as occurring in areas where viable fish habitat is present and no fisheries assessment has been conducted on these wetland areas.</p> <p>It is unclear how any potential for fish habitat in these wetlands was assessed and considered throughout the assessment on fish and fish habitat and wetlands and vegetation. Any anticipated changes to fish and fish habitat must be described to understand effects of the Project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the spatial extent of the surface area of potential or confirmed fish habitat for spawning, rearing, nursery, feeding, overwintering, and migration routes; and ii. a description of primary and secondary productivity of aquatic resources in terms of abundance and distribution in affected water bodies with a characterization of season variability.
IAAC-149	IAAC	<p>1.3 Project Location</p> <p>3.1 Project components</p> <p>3.2.1 Site preparation and construction</p> <p>6.1.4 Riparian, Wetland and Terrestrial Environments</p>	<p>2.7.2 Site Preparation</p> <p>Maps 5-1 and 5-2</p> <p>6.4.2.2 Project Pathways</p> <p>11.4.5.2 Mitigation</p> <p>Maps 22-1a to 22-2c</p> <p>Volume 5, Appendix A Lynn Lake Gold Project, Air Quality Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to identify environmentally sensitive areas, such as national, provincial, and regional parks, ecological reserves, wetlands, estuaries, and habitats of federally or provincially listed SAR and other sensitive areas. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe the site clearing/grading and excavation during site preparation and construction activities. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe topsoil storage and stockpiles (footprint, locations, volumes, development plans, and design criteria), and characterize soils in the excavation area, in terrestrial and riparian environments, and characterize wetlands (fens, marshes, peatlands, mudflats, and eelgrass beds, etc.). The location and extent of wetlands likely to be affected by Project activities according to their size type (class and form) and the description of the ecological function needs to be included.</p> <p>The EIS broadly describes land clearing, indicating that construction will begin with clearing areas within the PDA, that merchantable timber will be sold, and remaining cleared vegetation mulched and stored for use in active closure. The EIS also states that cutting/mowing/mulching wetland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Describe specific site clearing activities proposed at the ore milling and processing plant, open pits, stockpiles, TMF area, internal access roads, and ancillary facilities, including any grading, open burn, and excavation activities that are proposed. b. Indicate how site preparation activities will consider wetland and sensitive areas as well as terrain constrains. Clarify how wetlands and sensitive areas will be removed during site preparation activities. c. Indicate how and where materials removed during site preparation will be stored.

			<p>Technical Modelling Report Appendix F F.4.1.4 Land Clearing</p>	<p>vegetation will be an applicable mitigation measure for Change in Wetland Functions.</p> <p>EIS Chapter 6 provides an emission factor for uprooting and burning of material during land clearing (“861 ha within the MacLellan site and 187 ha within the Gordon site”) during construction. EIS Volume 5, Appendix A, Appendix F, Section F.4.1.4 Land Clearing shows estimates for greenhouse gas emissions assumed from burning cleared biomass (open burn with no salvage). However, there is no mention of burning as part of site preparation activities in Chapter 2.</p> <p>The EIS does not provide sufficient information on site clearing/grading and open burn and excavation activities within the PDA. More detail is required to understand the specific site clearing activities for Project components and how these activities will be carried out in wetland environments and sensitive areas within the PDA (such as in Maps 22-1a to 22-2c of the EIS), considering terrain constraints (as per Maps 5-1 and 5-2), and how and where removed materials (such as mulched, or grubbed vegetation) will be stored. This information is required to fully understand residual effects to wetlands and vegetation.</p>	
IAAC-150	IAAC	6.4 Mitigation measures	<p>11.4.2.2 Mitigation</p> <p>11.4.3.2 Mitigation</p> <p>11.4.3.3 Project Residual Effects</p> <p>11.4.4.2 Mitigation</p> <p>11.4.5.2 Mitigation</p> <p>Table 11-5</p> <p>Table 20B-1</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that mitigation measures for adverse environmental effects are presented in a manner that avoids ambiguity in intent and implementation. The EIS Guidelines also require that the EIS consider measures that are technically and economically feasible and that would mitigate any significant adverse environmental effects of the Project.</p> <p>The EIS provides mitigation measures for Changes in Wetland Functions, but specific mitigation measures pertaining to tailings management are missing. Table 11-5 indicates that the TMF has no interaction with “Change in Wetland Functions”, however, Section 11.4.3.3 indicates that irreversible loss of wetland plant communities is predicted, as well as a loss of 370.9 ha of wetland plant communities at the MacLellan site.</p> <p>Information is required for how Change in Wetland Functions will be mitigated for, inclusive of specific mitigation measures for the TMF, and any other Project component that may result in Change in Wetland Functions to understand the effects on migratory birds and SAR that use wetland habitat in the area. It is unclear what mitigations are proposed to limit the direct loss of wetlands and wetland function, such as through removal or dewatering activities. Information is needed on the mitigation</p>	<p>a. Clarify how the TMF will contribute to the direct and indirect loss of wetland function.</p> <p>b. Describe why the pathways of interaction between the TMF and wetland function were deselected.</p> <p>c. Identify and describe mitigation measures proposed to minimize Change in Wetland Functions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Include mitigation measures that will address effects to vegetation and wetlands from the TMF. ii. Include mitigation measures proposed to address effects from dewatering and the direct loss of wetlands. iii. Clarify whether and how mitigation measures will reduce or control the extent of Change in Wetland Functions.

				measures for TMF, construction, operation, and decommissioning and closure activities to understand Project effects on migratory birds and SAR.	
IAAC-151	MCCN-53	6.1.4 Riparian, wetland, and terrestrial environments	11.2 Existing Conditions for Vegetation and Wetlands Table 11-4	<p>The EIS Guidelines require a characterization of plant species (abundance, distribution, and diversity) and their habitats, with a focus on SAR or with special status that are of social, economic, cultural or scientific significance, and a description of changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>It is unclear how the characterization of plant species abundance, distribution, or habitats included plants of importance to Indigenous Groups. Table 11-4, for example, includes information on the number of observations and average percent cover of identified plant species of importance to Indigenous Groups, but does not describe the habitats in which these species are found, nor their estimated abundance and distribution within the LAA and RAA. Vegetation surveys conducted for the Project were not designed to target plant species of importance to Indigenous Groups and may not represent their total or relative abundance in the study area.</p> <p>Understanding the abundance and distribution of plant species and their habitat (under existing conditions, during operation, and throughout decommissioning and closure) for plants of importance to Indigenous Groups is crucial for understanding potential Project effects to the availability of these species.</p>	a. Describe the availability, abundance, and distribution of plant species of importance to each Indigenous Group in the LAA and RAA. Provide a map and a tabular summary of the habitats (i.e., land cover classes) for plant species of importance within the PDA, LAA, and RAA.
IAAC-152	CCN-67 CCN-68 CCN-73 CCN-79 MCCN-54 SDFN-73 SDFN-76 SDFN-81 SDFN-87	6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	11.1.2.1 Indigenous Engagement 11.2.2 Overview 11.4.4.3 Project Residual Effect 11.4.6 Project Residual Effects Tables 11-7 and 11-8	<p>The EIS Guidelines require a description of changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe any changes to the availability or quality of resources (fish, wildlife, birds, plants or other natural resources) used for traditional purposes.</p> <p>The EIS provides information of direct effects to wetland classes during construction and operation in Tables 11-7 and 11-8. However, the EIS does not identify key habitats for plant species of importance to Indigenous Groups and describe how these habitats may be directly and/or indirectly affected by the Project.</p> <p>A description of how changes to key habitats will affect plant species of importance to Indigenous Groups is needed. The EIS states that "Several vascular and non-vascular species are traditionally used by Indigenous</p>	a. Considering the responses to IAAC-147 and IAAC-151, for each species of importance to Indigenous Groups, calculate the total area of habitat present under existing conditions, as well as the total area that will be directly or indirectly affected by the Project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide a table summarizing the total area and percent change in area for each species' habitat within the PDA, LAA, and RAA under existing conditions, construction, operation, decommissioning and closure phases. If summarized by habitat type rather than by species, clearly link species and their occurrence in these

				<p>communities....were identified during community engagement (Table 11-4). All of the species identified by Indigenous communities were recorded in the RAA and are common species in Manitoba, with the exception of small water-lily (<i>Nymphaea tetragona</i>) and shrubby willow". In the absence of spatial distribution and habitats for culturally important plants, the EIS does not capture the locational importance of harvesting settings. The distribution, locales where particular plant species are found, and where traditional activities related to plants of importance take place are needed to understand effects. Section 11.1.2.1 identified the concerns that were shared by Indigenous Groups, however an assessment of the Project impacts to rights in the context of vegetation and wetlands, was not completed.</p> <p>Consideration of the potential for significant interruption of wetland function (upwards of 10 years for the Gordon site and 50 years for the MacLellan site) and the potential for there to be residual effects from the Project on the long-term viability of wetland functions was not included. The potential for indirect effects to plant species of importance, through changes to wetland functions, needs to be considered.</p> <p>Baseline surveys did not document the distribution and abundance of culturally important plants or describe the potential impacts to species of importance to Indigenous Groups. Understanding changes in the abundance and distribution of habitat for plants of interest to Indigenous Groups is crucial for understanding potential Project effects to the availability of these species and the maintenance of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982.</p>	<p>habitats.</p> <p>b. Describe how the assessment of effects to vegetation and wetlands considered the specific locales where plants of importance for traditional purposes may occur and how they were considered in the assessment of existing habitats and conditions for vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p>c. Describe how changes (as a result of direct and indirect effects) in the area of key habitats may affect the abundance, distribution, and quality of these plant species of importance.</p> <p>d. Considering the response to IAAC-157, describe the potential indirect effects to plant species of importance from the potential long-term residual effects to wetland function.</p>
IAAC-153	CCN-69 IAAC SDFN-77	4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge 5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised 6.4 Mitigation Measures	11.4.2.2 Mitigation 11.4.3.2 Mitigation 11.4.4.2 Mitigation 11.4.5.2 Mitigation Table 20B-1	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the presentation of technically and economically feasible mitigation measures for each VC and to consider Aboriginal traditional knowledge and input from Indigenous Groups in the development of mitigation measures and follow-up programs that evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures. Additionally, the EIS Guidelines require the identification of adaptive measures that would be informed by follow-up programs. The EIS Guidelines require measures be written as specific (to each environmental effect identified) commitments describing intended implementation, and the environmental outcome the measure is designed to address. The EIS is also required to describe the Project's environmental protection plan and its environmental management system.</p>	<p>a. Provide specific technically and economically feasible mitigation measures for Change in Landscape Diversity and Change in Wetland Functions, for all phases of the Project (construction, operation, and decommissioning and closure).</p> <p>i. Clarify how the TMF capping and the establishment of the 30 m buffer for wetland in the PDA will mitigate Change in Landscape Diversity and Change in Wetland Functions across all phases of the Project.</p>

				<p>EIS Section 11.4.2.2 describes mitigation measures for Change in Landscape Diversity, such as the capping of 75% of the TMF post-operation and reseeding of native areas disturbed. It is unclear what mitigations are proposed besides restriction of construction/operation activity to the PDA. It is not clear how post-operation measures will address the effects to landscape diversity during construction and operation phases. It is unclear what mitigation measures are proposed for Project components and activities such as the TMF. Additional information is required about the specific technically and economically feasible mitigation measures to mitigate the effects to landscape diversity during all phases of the Project.</p> <p>EIS Section 11.4.5.2 identifies overall mitigation measures for Change in Wetland Functions, such as the establishment of a 30 m buffer for wetlands adjacent to the PDA. The EIS does not provide information as to how this boundary will mitigate effects to wetlands adjacent to the PDA. The EIS needs to clarify how the selected mitigation measures (such as TMF capping and 30 m buffer establishment) were chosen and will mitigate effects to Change in Landscape Diversity and Change in Wetland Functions across all phases of the Project.</p> <p>The EIS states that for Change in Landscape Diversity; Change in Community Diversity; Change in Species Diversity; and Change in Wetland Functions, “Detailed design of the Project and mitigation strategies is currently ongoing” and will be “refined in consideration of environmental assessment approval conditions and permit stipulations which will be incorporated into final environmental management planning”. The EIS also states that effectiveness will be confirmed by professionals and reviewed by regulatory agencies. It is unclear what mitigation measures are proposed and committed to as the statement refers to future work, rather than specifying the considered measures.</p> <p>This information is required to understand the residual effects to wetlands, vegetation, and associated effects of changes to the environment on Indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>b. Clarify and describe the mitigation measures that are considered and will be implemented for Change in Landscape Diversity; Change in Community Diversity; Change in Species Diversity; and Change in Wetland Functions. Describe any proposed mitigation measures that are undergoing development, for all Project phases.</p> <p>c. Clarify how mitigation measures for effects to vegetation and wetlands, through Change in Landscape Diversity; Change in Community Diversity; Change in Species Diversity; and Change in Wetland Functions, considered Aboriginal traditional knowledge and potential impacts to Indigenous peoples and their rights.</p>
IAAC-154	CCN-75 IAAC SDFN-83	1.4 Regulatory framework and the role of government	11.1.1 Regulatory and Policy Setting 11.4.3 Change in Community Diversity	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to identify the legislation and other regulatory approvals that are applicable to the Project at the federal, provincial, regional, and municipal level, as well as to identify government policies, resource management plans, planning or study initiatives pertinent to the Project and/or EA and their implications. The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS provide mitigation measures, including</p>	<p>a. Provide an outline of the requirements for the Project under <i>The Water Rights Act</i> for a wetland offsetting, restoration or enhancement plan, and an outline of the proposed approach.</p>

		6.4 Mitigation measures	<p>11.4.4 Change in Species Diversity</p> <p>11.4.5 Change in Wetland Functions</p> <p>11.4.6 Project Residual Effects</p> <p>Table 11-9</p>	<p>measures to eliminate, reduce or control the adverse environmental effects of the Project, as well as restitution for damage to the environment through replacement, restoration, compensation or other means.</p> <p>The EIS considered the regulator approvals under <i>The Water Rights Act</i> of Manitoba in the assessment of effects on vegetation and wetlands, which was to include wetland offsetting requirements for wetland loss (Government of Manitoba 2019). The EIS states that “Marsh and swamp wetlands may require a license and restoration or enhancement plan prior to disturbance”, as well as that “Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation policy is used as guidance to maintain consistency with national priorities for wetland conservation”. The EIS indicated that “Compensation for wetland loss will not be completed under the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation because this Project is not located in an area of high historical wetland loss or located on federal lands.”</p> <p>Section 11.4.6 indicates a “moderate magnitude, long-term loss of 660.0 ha of wetland as a result of clearing for development of the Gordon site, as well as from dewatering of the open pit, and natural refilling of the open pit post reclamation”. The EIS also indicates that 370.9 ha of wetland will be directly lost at the McLellan site during construction. Table 11-9 indicates that the changes to Change in Community Diversity; Change in Species Diversity; and Change in Wetland Functions is adverse.</p> <p>Clarity is required regarding how any compensatory measures will contribute to net loss or gain of wetland habitats to understand residual effects to vegetation and wetlands. The EIS needs to describe any applicable regulatory requirements, and subsequent actions and mitigations that would be undertaken to minimize potential effects to vegetation and wetlands.</p>	<p>b. Provide an outline of the use of the Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation as a guiding document and implications for mitigations.</p> <p>c. Provide proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or control the adverse environmental effects to Change in Community Diversity; Change in Species Diversity; and Change in Wetland Functions, respectively. Identify replacement, restoration, compensation or other means, as may be required by federal, provincial, regional, and municipal level regulatory approvals.</p> <p>d. Describe how any additional compensatory measures will contribute to or change the assessment of net gain or loss of wetlands.</p>
IAAC-155	<p>CCN-71 CCN-72 CCN-74</p> <p>SDFN-79 SDFN-80 SDFN-82</p>	<p>4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge</p> <p>6.4 Mitigation measures</p>	<p>11.4.4.2 Mitigation</p> <p>11.4.4.3 Project Residual Effect</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require identification and description of mitigation measures to avoid or lessen potential adverse effects on listed COSEWIC species, and species harvested by Indigenous Groups. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to consider Aboriginal traditional knowledge in the development of mitigation measures, and develop a follow-up program that evaluates the effectiveness of mitigation measures with input from Indigenous Groups. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p>	<p>a. Provide specific mitigation measures that will address the remaining moderate to high, direct and indirect effects and uncertainties (i.e., abundance) surrounding plant SOCCs and plant species of importance to Indigenous Groups during all phases of the Project.</p> <p>b. Identify how Indigenous Groups will be involved in the development, implementation, and follow-up</p>

				<p>The EIS states that development of the Gordon and the MacLellan sites “will adversely affect known plant SOCCs and species used for traditional purposes during construction and operation, but with mitigation and reclamation, these effects will be moderate to high in magnitude. The uncertainty in magnitude is attributed to the lack of information on SOCC and traditional use species abundance in the RAA.”</p> <p>The EIS provides mitigation measures for Change in Species Diversity for vegetation and wetlands, and describes avoidance, transplanting, isolated (spot spraying) herbicide use and weed control, and dust suppression as some of the mitigation measures that will be applied. The EIS does not provide mitigation measures specifically for species of importance to Indigenous Groups (i.e., harvested species) as the measures focus on SOCC. Specific mitigations for plant species of importance to Indigenous Groups are required, and any overlaps in mitigations for SOCC need to be specified. Potential indirect effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups needs to be considered and residual effects assessed for direct and indirect changes to species of importance.</p> <p>Additional information on mitigation measures that will be used to address Project effects to plant SOCCs and species of importance to Indigenous Groups is required to understand the residual effects to these species.</p>	<p>of any mitigation measures for plant species of importance (i.e., harvested species).</p>
IAAC-156	CCN-70 SDFN-78	6.4 Mitigation measures	<p>11.4.2 Change in Landscape Diversity</p> <p>11.4.3 Change in Community Diversity</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the identification and description of mitigation measures to avoid or lessen potential adverse effects on species and/or critical habitat listed under SARA and that these measures will be consistent with any applicable recovery strategy and action plans. The EIS Guidelines also require the identification and description of mitigation measures to avoid or lessen adverse effects on listed COSEWIC species, and species harvested by Indigenous Groups. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>The EIS presents mitigation measures for Change in Landscape Diversity and Community Diversity, and presents the use of native seed mix as one of those measures. Further information regarding the use of native seed mixes, and how the application of this mitigation measure will involve Indigenous Groups and consider the potential effects to other plant species (e.g., SAR, SOCC, species of importance) is required to understand the residual effects to wetlands and vegetation.</p>	<p>a. Provide clarity on the use of seed mixes in mitigation measures including the identification of contexts in which seeding will occur (i.e., Project phases, following specific activities, reclamation/closure, etc.) and potential effects of seed mixes to other plant species (e.g., SAR, SOCC, species of importance).</p> <p>b. Identify how the selection of the seed mixes will involve and be informed by Indigenous Groups and consider plants species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p>

IAAC-157	CCN-76 CCN-77 CCN-79 SDFN-84 SDFN-85 SDFN-87	4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge 6.5 Significance of residual effects	11.4.6 Project Residual Effects 11.7.1 Significance of Project Residual Effects	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to provide a detailed analysis of the significance of the residual environmental effects that are considered adverse following the implementation of mitigation measures, and identify all criteria used to assign significance ratings and terms used to describe the level of significance, including magnitude, geographic extent, timing, duration, frequency, reversibility, and ecological and social context. The EIS is required to integrate Aboriginal traditional knowledge into defining significance criteria and analysis. This assessment must contain clear and sufficient information to enable the Agency, technical and regulatory agencies, Indigenous Groups, and the public to review the proponent's analysis of the significance of effects.</p> <p>The EIS notes that construction at the Gordon site will result in the direct loss of 66.5 ha of wetland function and services (nutrient cycling, decomposition, carbon sequestration, water filtration and storage, and habitat) and that there will be a “moderate magnitude, long-term loss of 660.0 ha of wetland as a result of clearing for development of the Gordon site, as well as from dewatering of the open pit, and natural refilling of the open pit post reclamation”. The EIS states that “10 years after reclamation, measurable changes to groundwater recharge/discharge, water storage sediment retention and carbon sequestration are not anticipated, and wetland function should begin to recover”.</p> <p>The EIS states that during construction and operation at the MacLellan site “...there will be permanent loss of 370.9 ha of wetland area in the LAA. There is potential that 603.2 ha of wetland function indirectly lost by construction and operation of the MacLellan site. However, 50 years after reclamation, measurable changes to groundwater recharge/discharge, water storage, and sediment retention and carbon sequestration are not anticipated, and wetland function should begin to recover...”.</p> <p>For both sites, the EIS states that “effects to wetland function are predicted to be continuous, moderate in magnitude, long-term in duration, restricted to the LAA, and reversible/irreversible”.</p> <p>It is unclear how the duration of effects (10 years post reclamation at the Gordon site and 50 years post reclamation at the MacLellan site), and the potential extent of interruption in the exercise of rights and displacement of Indigenous harvesters from the area was considered in the determination of magnitude and significance of effects. There is potential for significant Project residual effects as the long-term viability of wetland</p>	<p>a. Describe all considerations and factors that were used to draw conclusions about magnitude and significance of Project residual effects on vegetation and wetlands.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Clarify how direct and indirect loss of wetlands were considered in the conclusions. (Consider the response to IAAC-147 part c.) ii. Clarify how magnitude, geographic extent, timing, duration, frequency, reversibility, ecological and social context, and Aboriginal traditional knowledge was considered in the conclusion on significance of effects. iii. Clarify how the duration of effects (10 years post reclamation at the Gordon site and 50 years post reclamation at the MacLellan site), were considered in the significance conclusion. Describe the potential extent of interruption in current use of lands and resources by Indigenous peoples, the exercise of rights, and the displacement of Indigenous harvesters from the area.
----------	---	--	--	--	---

				<p>functions and plant species of importance to Indigenous Groups may be threatened.</p> <p>Information is required clarifying how residual environmental effects on vegetation and wetlands are predicted to be not significant. The loss of wetlands and the duration of impacts may be adverse and substantial in the context of effects of these changes on Indigenous peoples and impacts to rights of Indigenous Groups and must be considered.</p>	
IAAC-158	CCN-78 SDFN-86	<p>6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p> <p>6.6.3 Cumulative effects assessment</p>	11.5 Assessment of Cumulative Environmental Effects on Vegetation and Wetlands	<p>The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of the cumulative effects on current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, focusing on relevant activities, and to consider overall impacts on Indigenous rights-based activities, traditional lands and resources, and health and socio-economic conditions. The EIS also requires a description of changes to riparian, wetland, and terrestrial environments, and changes to key habitat for species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>The EIS provides an overview of the cumulative effects pathways for Change in Landscape Diversity, Community Diversity, Species Diversity, and Wetland Functions, and summarizes the residual cumulative effects. However, the EIS does not describe post-closure impacts to traditional land users, such as, access to species of importance and disruption of access to wetland areas spanning 10-50 years. Clarity on how the cumulative effects assessment considered potential impacts to vegetation and wetlands and Indigenous rights and rights-based activities is required. An assessment of all indirect effects to vegetation and wetlands is also needed for the cumulative effects assessment.</p> <p>The EIS does not describe how the pathways of effects considered interact between the identified pathways themselves (Change in Landscape Diversity, Community Diversity, Species Diversity, and Wetland Functions). For example, it is unclear how Change in Landscape Diversity and Wetland Functions have overlapping, interacting, and cumulative effects on species diversity and vice versa. Additional information on the cumulative effects assessment for vegetation and wetlands is required to understand cumulative effects to this VC and others, such as Indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>a. Describe how the potential interaction of pathways of effects (direct and indirect) were considered and how interaction of pathways of effects to landscape diversity, wetland function, and species diversity have potential to contribute to each other and cumulatively interact.</p> <p>b. Update the cumulative effects assessment for vegetation and wetlands to consider the cumulative effects on current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. Consider the timeframes and potential impacts of post-closure phases for the sites spanning 10-50 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Describe how effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups and subsequent impacts to rights-based activities were considered in the cumulative effects assessment, any related mitigation measures, and residual effects for all phases of the Project. ii. Describe how indirect effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups were considered in the residual and cumulative effects assessments.

IAAC-159	CCN-131 MCCN-102 MCCN-103 SDFN-152	8.0 Follow-up and Monitoring Programs	23.5 Environmental Monitoring and Management Plans	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that follow-up and monitoring programs will include specific details, such as the parameters to be measured, the planned timing for follow-up studies, monitoring methods, reporting mechanisms, and how Indigenous Groups will be included in the development and implementation of the plans and programs. The EIS Guidelines require an outline of a preliminary monitoring program, including description of its characteristics (e.g., location of interventions, planned protocols, list of measured parameters, analytical methods employed, regulatory instruments, schedule, human and financial resources required, Indigenous engagement, production of monitoring reports and sharing of information).</p> <p>The EIS outlines the Soil Management and Rehabilitation Plan, Vegetation and Weed Management Plan, and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan in Chapter 23. These follow-up and monitoring programs have yet to be developed in sufficient detail to meet specific requirements outlined in the EIS Guidelines. Additionally, the EIS does not delineate how the Surface Water Monitoring and Management Plan will account for follow-up and monitoring specific to vegetation and wetlands by providing a sub-plan or specifying specific measures that will be undertaken for this VC as part of surface water monitoring and follow-up. Provided there may be effects to wetlands and vegetation as a result of surface water effects and vice versa, it is important to specify how monitoring and follow-up will consider the interface of these two VCs (i.e., in wetland environments with surface water).</p> <p>This information and detail is required to understand the follow-up and monitoring activities the proponent is proposing for vegetation and wetlands. This information is also required to understand how Indigenous Groups will be involved in the development and implementation of follow-up and monitoring for vegetation and wetlands.</p>	<p>a. Provide details of the follow-up and monitoring programs for the following plans, describing the parameters to be measured, planned timing for follow up studies, monitoring methods, and reporting mechanisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Soil Management and Rehabilitation Plan ii. Vegetation and Weed Management Plan iii. Considering the responses provided for Round 1 Package 1, IAAC-39, clarify how the Surface Water Monitoring and Management Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will account for follow-up and monitoring specific to vegetation and wetlands. <p>b. Describe how Indigenous Groups will be involved in the development, implementation, monitoring, and follow-up activities for vegetation and wetlands, in the context of the Soil Management and Rehabilitation Plan; Vegetation and Weed Management Plan; Erosion and Sediment Control Plan; and the Surface Water Monitoring and Management Plan. Consider the response provided for Round 1 Package 1, IAAC-39.</p>
Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat					
IAAC-160	IAAC SDFN-94	6.1.4 Riparian, Wetland and Terrestrial Environments 6.1.9 Indigenous peoples	12.2.1.1 Background Review 12.2.2.1 Wildlife Species	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that plant and animal species and their habitats, with a focus on SAR or species with special status that are of social, economic, cultural or scientific significance, as well as invasive alien species and species used for traditional purposes by Indigenous Groups, be identified. The EIS Guidelines require changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes be identified. The EIS Guidelines require baseline information for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes with focus on the traditional</p>	<p>a. Provide all sources of baseline information (including information on current use of lands and resources) that were used for the determination of wildlife species of importance to be used in the effects assessment for wildlife and wildlife habitat. Describe how this information was gathered / will be gathered and how engagement with Indigenous Groups informed / will inform the selection of</p>

		6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments		<p>activity (including hunting, fishing, trapping, plant gathering, and cultural practices) and include a characterization of the attributes of the activity that may be affected by Project-related changes. This includes identifying species of importance and assessing the quality and quantity of preferred traditional resources and locations, timing (e.g., seasonality, access restrictions, distance from community), ambient/sensory environment (e.g., noise, air quality, visual landscape, presence of others) and cultural environment (e.g., historical/generational connections, preferred areas).</p> <p>The EIS provides an overview of species for which Project effects were assessed and provides a list of information used to inform the selection of species for assessment. The EIS does not provide a list or a comprehensive definition of all wildlife species considered in the assessment that are considered “species of importance”. It is unclear how species of importance were defined in the EIS and what individual species were selected as species of importance, or how engagement with Indigenous Groups informed the inclusion of those species. Rationale for exclusion of or selection of focal species to represent species of importance is needed. The EIS also needs to identify what baseline information for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes was used to identify species of importance.</p> <p>This information is required to understand what information was used in the determination of species of importance and what species of importance are considered in the assessment to understand the Project effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p>	<p>wildlife species as “of importance” in the assessment of effects for wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>b. Provide a comprehensive list of the wildlife species that fall under the definition of “species of importance” for Indigenous Groups in the effects assessment and provide a rationale for any exclusions, and selections of focal/representative species.</p>
IAAC-161	CCN-83 ECCC-28 MCCN-58 SDFN-91 Early Technical Review ECCC-02	3.2.2 Valued components to be examined 3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries 6.1.7 Migratory birds and their habitat 6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland	4.3.2.1 Spatial Boundaries 11.1.4 Boundaries 12.1.4 Boundaries 12.4 Assessment of Residual Environmental Effects on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat	<p>The EIS Guidelines require a rationale for each spatial boundary and how they account for the appropriate scale and spatial extent of potential environmental effects, community and Aboriginal traditional knowledge, and current or TLRU by Indigenous Groups, including ecological, technical, social, and cultural considerations. The EIS Guidelines also require that effects to migratory birds and their habitat are identified, and changes to the habitat of migratory and non-migratory birds, critical habitat for federally listed SAR, and important habitat for species designated by COSEWIC (SOCC) be identified. Adverse effects of the Project on SAR, COSEWIC, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups are to be clearly described and assessed.</p> <p>Effects of noise/vibration to migratory birds, waterfowl, wetland-affiliated birds, SAR (including caribou), and species of importance to Indigenous</p>	<p>a. Describe why the spatial boundaries (i.e., PDA, LAA, and RAA) for wildlife and wildlife habitat were used for the assessment of Project effects to migratory birds, SAR, SOCC, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups and how those boundaries were chosen.</p> <p>b. Provide rationale for the spatial boundaries (i.e., PDA, LAA, and RAA) considered for the Project effects identified for SAR, SOCC, migratory birds, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups (i.e., Boreal Caribou) considering the potential for sensory disturbance from Project activities by</p>

		<p>and terrestrial environments</p> <p>6.3.2 Migratory birds</p> <p>6.3.3 Species at risk</p>	<p>Effects of mine development on woodland caribou <i>Rangifer tarandus</i> distribution; Weir, Mahoney, McLaren, and Ferguson (2007)</p>	<p>Groups are expected to vary as species have different responses to stressors. It is unclear how noise effects to these groups of species are included in the assessment and conclusions for wildlife and wildlife habitat. For example, the LAA for noise and vibration is a 2 km buffer applied from the PDA; but the LAA for wildlife and wildlife habitat was a 1 km buffer from the PDA. The EIS states that “the LAA was established to consider the area in which Project activities might result in indirect habitat loss due to sensory disturbance (i.e., displacement or avoidance)... while considering the maximum recommended setback distances for SAR and SOCC...”.</p> <p>The rationale for the spatial boundaries for wildlife and wildlife habitat does not provide clarity on how potential indirect effects to wildlife and associated Indigenous land and resource use, particularly as a result of sensory disturbance, were captured. Given the potential of effects to migratory birds, SOCC, SAR, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups, information on the selection of PDA, LAA, and RAA for the all encompassing “Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat” is needed.</p> <p>In the case of Boreal Caribou, supporting rationale and information is needed for the selection of spatial boundaries for Boreal Caribou (i.e., a 1 km buffer in the LAA), considering information/research available on effects of mining on caribou. Weir et al, for example, conducted a seasonal analysis of Woodland Caribou avoidance around an open pit mine site, and found that caribou avoided areas within 4 km of the mine site across most seasons, and that the caribou group size and numbers of caribou decreased within 6 km of the mine with progression of mining activity in the late winter, pre-calving, and calving seasons.</p> <p>Project components and activities at both sites and PR 391 have different predicted schedules and timing of disturbance (e.g., construction noise, blasting, crushing, equipment operation, truck transport). The inherent differences in sensory disturbance or mortality risk that these activities pose for migratory birds, SOCC, SAR, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups may necessitate consideration at a larger spatial scale to fully capture the extent of Project effects.</p> <p>Because residual effects to SAR, SOCC, migratory birds, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups are assessed under the broad category of ‘Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat’ by site and phase, the residual effects assessment does not describe specific effects to these groups of species in a manner that allows clear conclusions to be drawn on unique effects to these groups of species and the significance of those effects.</p>	<p>comparing to spatial boundaries for other VCs (such as noise and vibration).</p> <p>c. If the spatial boundaries for migratory birds, SAR, SOCC, and species of importance change based off the response to part b, update the assessment of effects as needed. Consider providing an assessment for migratory birds, SAR, SOCC, and species of importance as separate VCs or as sub-VCs of wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>d. Clarify how the significance of the residual effects assessment accounted for potential effects to migratory birds, SAR, SOCC, and for species of importance to Indigenous Groups. If the residual effects assessment did not account for these, update the assessment of significance for migratory birds, SAR, SOCC, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups based on the information provided in part c.</p>
--	--	---	---	---	--

				Clarity is needed regarding how the spatial boundaries are assessed for effects to migratory birds, SAR, SOCC, species of importance to Indigenous Groups, their habitat, residual effects, and significance conclusions. This information is required to understand the significance of residual effects to migratory birds, SAR, SOCC, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups.	
IAAC-162	ECCC-29 Early Technical Review ECCC-03	4.3 Study strategy and methodology 6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments 6.3.3 Species at risk	12.1.4.2 Temporal Boundaries 12.3 Project Interactions With Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat 12.4.2 Assessment of Change in Habitat Table 12-11	<p>The EIS Guidelines state that the assessment of effects for each of the Project components and physical activities, in all phases, will be based on a comparison of the biophysical and human environments between the predicted future conditions with and without the Project, including the overall description of changes related to landscape disturbance. The EIS Guidelines also require the EIS to identify the potential adverse effects of the Project on SARA listed species and, where appropriate, its critical habitat. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe changes to interprovincial wildlife, including any changes to the Manitoba North Range (MB9) Boreal Woodland Caribou such as habitat, movement or migratory corridors.</p> <p>When assessing the changes related to landscape disturbance on the future biophysical environmental conditions, the assessment needs to include the predicted natural changes to habitat conditions within the RAA for SAR over the temporal boundaries of the Project. For example, the quantification of habitat disturbance for Boreal Caribou (particularly at the MacLellan site) could influence the significance of effects determination.</p> <p>Baseline information in the EIS includes a description of habitat and caribou use at the range scale, including pre-Project (existing) disturbance conditions, available biophysical attributes, and caribou use. The EIS identifies the temporal boundaries that are used in the assessment of effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat which includes the decommissioning phase at both sites. Given the expected temporal span of the Project, the effects of direct (e.g., habitat loss) and indirect habitat disturbances (e.g., sensory disturbance) in the LAA will likely change during the life of the Project. Information is required on the indirect effects to caribou habitat through sensory disturbance associated with relative increases in traffic/noise/vibration on access/haul roads and on the MacLellan and Gordon sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide a description of how the complete lifespan of the Project was considered in the assessment of the changes to landscape disturbance. Include an assessment of sensory disturbance (including differential potential for sensory disturbance across the Project sites), and indirect effects of the Project for changes to habitat for SAR (including Boreal Caribou). b. Provide a description of the fire history (i.e., areas disturbed by fire and time since the fire) in the RAA and an assessment of any possible forest stand recovery during the life of the Project that would contribute to SAR (including Boreal Caribou) habitat in the RAA. c. Assess how natural changes to future habitat conditions might change the quantification of disturbance for Boreal Caribou habitat, within the RAA over the temporal boundaries of the Project.

				<p>ECCC states that habitat suitability for Boreal Caribou may increase in the RAA as the forest structure matures (i.e., natural fire recovery), and needs to be considered in the context of future conditions with and without the Project. This consideration could impact Boreal Caribou use of the habitat in the LAA throughout the life of the Project.</p> <p>Information is required on the predicted changes to disturbance conditions, including the assessment of regeneration of fire affected habitat; restoration and revegetation during the closure/post-closure phase; and changes in available biophysical attributes within the Project RAA with the consideration of the MB9 and Manitoba's Kamuchawie Management Unit (KMU) ranges for Boreal Caribou, over the life of the Project.</p> <p>This information is required to understand the effects to SAR, and their habitat, inclusive of Boreal Caribou.</p>	
IAAC-163	<p>ECCC-27</p> <p>IAAC</p> <p>MCCN-57</p> <p>Early Technical Review</p> <p>ECCC-01</p>	<p>3.2.2 Valued components to be examined</p> <p>6.2 Predicted changes to the physical environment</p> <p>6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments</p> <p>6.3.2 Migratory birds</p>	<p>4.3.1.1 Selection of Valued Components</p> <p>12.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>12.1 Scope of Assessment</p> <p>12.2.2.1 Wildlife Species</p> <p>12.2.2.3 Habitat</p> <p>12.4.2 Assessment of Change in Habitat</p> <p>Table 12-1</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that changes to the habitat of migratory and non-migratory birds must be distinctly discussed and include losses, structural changes, and fragmentation of riparian habitat of terrestrial environments and wetlands frequented by birds (types of cover, ecological unit of the area in terms of quality, quantity, diversity, distribution, and functions). The EIS Guidelines require a description of changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. The EIS Guidelines require the identification of specific mitigation measures for migratory birds and an assessment of residual effects to birds listed under the MBCA and Schedule 1 of SARA. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe any potential direct and indirect adverse effects, including sensory and observable change indicators, on migratory birds, including population level effects that could be caused by all Project activities and require changes be described in terms of magnitude, geographic extent, duration, frequency, and reversibility.</p> <p>Migratory birds as a group are not identified as a VC in the EIS. Effects to select migratory birds and their habitat are assessed under composite VCs of wildlife and wildlife habitat and vegetation and wetlands, and through assessed effects pathways including to other VCs. The significance determination for residual effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat considers four bird SAR: Common Nighthawk, Olive-sided Flycatcher, Barn Swallow, and Rusty Blackbird. In the EIS, waterfowl and species associated with wetland and fen habitat types are noted to be of importance to Indigenous Groups and thus Mallard, Common Loon, and Lesser Scaup are included in</p>	<p>a. Provide an assessment of direct and indirect changes to habitat specific to migratory birds in terms of anticipated losses, structural changes, and fragmentation of riparian habitat of terrestrial environments and wetlands frequented by migratory birds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide a summary of potential changes to habitat for migratory birds. ii. Include information on the habitat types (i.e., land cover classes or ecological units) frequented by each category of birds (i.e., migratory and non-migratory), and potential changes in terms of quality, quantity, and distribution for each habitat type. <p>b. Provide species-specific mitigation measures for migratory bird species and species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>c. Provide an assessment of direct and indirect effects as well as an assessment of significance of residual effects for the following bird groups:</p>

			Volume 4, Appendix N Bird Baseline Technical Data Report	<p>the ERA. However, residual effects to waterfowl are not specifically highlighted in the EIS nor assessed for potential significance. The potential significance of Project residual effects to migratory birds are not clearly described as part of wildlife and wildlife habitat and vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p>The EIS provides a description of changes to habitat for birds species overall (migratory and non-migratory) however, it is difficult to parse out where the changes are specific to migratory bird species, and where they are applicable to all bird species. It is not clear how the potential significance of Project residual effects or sufficiency of mitigation measures and follow-up and monitoring for migratory birds and bird species of importance to Indigenous Groups were determined. While changes in habitat have been broadly discussed, the information regarding changes and fragmentation of the habitat types frequented by each of these two bird categories, in terms of quality, quantity, diversity, distribution, or functions is needed. All conclusions in the EIS for migratory birds, need to encompass all potential changes to habitat.</p> <p>This information is needed to understand specific mitigation measures for migratory birds and bird species of importance to Indigenous Groups, and to assess residual effects to birds listed under the MBCA and Schedule 1 of the SARA, as required by the EIS Guidelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. migratory bird species present in the Project area (i.e., as described in Chapter 12 and Appendix N); and ii. bird species of importance to Indigenous Groups, such as Mallard, Common Loon, and Lesser Scaup.
IAAC-164	MCCN-55	<p>2.4 Application of the precautionary approach</p> <p>6.3.3 Species at risk</p> <p>6.4. Mitigation measures</p>	<p>12.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>12.2.2.2 Species at Risk and Species of Conservation Concern</p> <p>Tables 12-1 and 12-8</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of the potential adverse effects of the Project on SARA listed species and species assessed by COSEWIC as extirpated, endangered, threatened, or of special concern. The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS present information on residences, seasonal movements, movement corridors, habitat requirements, key habitat areas, identified critical habitat and/or recovery habitat (where applicable), and general life history of SAR that may occur in the Project area, or be affected by the Project. The EIS Guidelines require that the precautionary approach be applied and that the EIS identify and describe mitigation measures to avoid or lessen potential adverse effects on species and/or critical habitat listed under SARA and listed COSEWIC species consistent with applicable recovery strategy and action plans.</p> <p>EIS Table 12-8 summarizes the 15 SAR and SOCC with the potential to occur in the RAA. Six SAR (Horned Grebe, Yellow Rail, Short-Eared Owl, Bank Swallow, Evening Grosbeak, and Northern Leopard Frog) and 1 SOCC (Trumpeter Swan) were not included on the basis that they are unlikely to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide an assessment of potential effects of the Project on SAR and SOCC (listed COSEWIC species) that were not assessed. Describe the potential Project effects to each of the species. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Update the effects assessment for wildlife and wildlife habitat using this information. b. Provide mitigation measures and follow-up/monitoring as necessary for the potential effects within the RAA to SAR and SOCC (listed COSEWIC species) identified in part a.

				<p>be affected by the Project for reasons such as that they are not known to regularly occupy the RAA and there is a lack of suitable breeding habitat in the RAA. Additionally, Barren-Ground Caribou are not assessed on the basis that the Project does not overlap with its modern range. An absence of regular occurrence or detections within the RAA does not preclude the use of this area for SAR and SOCC.</p> <p>Information on the potential effects to all SAR and SOCC with potential to overlap with the Project, as well as mitigation measures that avoid or lessen these potential adverse effects are required to understand the residual effects to SAR and SOCC.</p>	
IAAC-165	MCCN-56	6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments	<p>12.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>Table 12-12</p> <p>Volume 4, Appendix M Mammal Baseline Technical Data Report</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of changes to key habitat for species important to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. The EIS must identify and describe mitigation measures to avoid or lessen adverse effects on species harvested by Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>Habitat modeling and assessments of potential Project effects on habitat availability have not been included in the Project proposal for species of importance to Indigenous Groups such as moose, gray wolf, black bear, American marten, or beaver. Baseline studies conducted (EIS Volume 4, Appendix M) reveal high moose density, numerous furbearer observations, and active beaver lodge locations overlapping with both of the wildlife PDAs and LAAs indicating frequent use of the Project area by these species.</p> <p>The EIS did not provide an assessment of potential changes in habitat for species of importance to Indigenous Groups. The EIS summarized residual changes to wildlife habitat land cover class in Table 12-12, but it is not clear how the assessment addressed changes to habitat for species of importance to Indigenous Groups. The EIS does not provide species-specific mitigation measures that avoid or lessen effects to species of importance.</p> <p>Information on species-specific effects from the Project and changes in habitat, as well as mitigation measures, is required to understand the residual effects on these species and consequently to understand the full impacts to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p>	<p>a. Provide a map and summary of potential changes to habitat (i.e., similar to what was provided in Table 12-12) for species of importance to Indigenous Groups, such as moose, gray wolf, black bear, and beaver, including the area and percent change within the PDA, LAAs, and RAAs potentially affected by direct and indirect effects of all phases of the Project.</p> <p>b. Provide mitigation measures to address the effects of changes to habitat for species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p>
IAAC-166	SDFN-95 SDFN-96 SDFN-98 SDFN-99	2.4 Application of the precautionary approach	12.2.2.2 Species at Risk and Species of	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to identify and describe mitigation measures to lessen or avoid effects to species and/or critical habitat listed under SARA. The EIS Guidelines also require the EIS to determine significance of residual effects after applying technically and economically</p>	<p>a. Describe the limitations of the information gathered through the use of camera surveys in the effects assessment and on the conclusions drawn about the presence of caribou in the Project area.</p>

	Advice from ECCC to the Agency	4.3 Study strategy and methodology 6.4 Mitigation measures	Conservation Concern 12.4.2.4 Project Residual Effect for Change in Habitat 12.7.1 Significance of Project Residual Effects	<p>feasible mitigation measures, and that the environmental effects assessment will use the best available information and methods as well as the precautionary approach.</p> <p>The EIS states that “ indirect loss or alteration of habitat within the Manitoba North Range (MB9) and KMU may be inconsistent with the objectives of the federal and provincial woodland caribou recovery strategies (Government of Canada 2015, MBWCMC 2015)”. The EIS specifies that the Project is unlikely to materially affect the survival and recovery of Boreal Caribou based on the relatively small and indirect losses of habitat adjacent to existing disturbance. The EIS states “there has been no evidence to suggest the contemporary range of woodland caribou includes the Project area”. It is unclear how the proponent determined that caribou survival and recovery will not be materially affected given that Project effects may be inconsistent with recovery strategies.</p> <p>The EIS indicates that the “provincial Kamuchawie Caribou Management Unit (KMU) and the federal Woodland Caribou Manitoba North Range (MB9) both encompass the RAA” (Map 15-5) but that “no provincial woodland caribou (concern) range has been delineated to date within the Kamuchawie Caribou Management” due to the lack of data, unavailability of population size, trend, or distribution data. However, Boreal Caribou are reported to typically occur more than 80 km southwest of the RAA. Unavailability of data does not constitute evidence that suggests contemporary ranges do not exist in the Project vicinity. The EIS does not clearly explain how a lack of information accounted for uncertainty in the assessment of effects to caribou habitat and how the proponent intends to provide any new information when it becomes available.</p> <p>Sixty seven percent of the Manitoba North Range (MB9) is undisturbed habitat for Boreal Caribou, which is close to the minimum target of 65% of undisturbed habitat. There is no information on how the precautionary principle was applied to the assessment of effects to Boreal Caribou in light of the absence of information and the thresholds for the KMU and the Manitoba North Range (MB9).</p> <p>The EIS states camera surveys were used to identify caribou individuals, and is suggestive of probable wider caribou use of the study area. The EIS needs to consider available provincial data (e.g., winter 2019-20 aerial surveys) on caribou use and range, utilizing available data.</p>	<p>b. Describe how the effects assessment considered and accounted for the lack of Boreal Caribou range information for the KMU, and the uncertainties in assessing Project contributions to disturbance in the Manitoba North Range (MB9) and the target of 65% undisturbed habitat.</p> <p>c. Describe how the proponent will continue to incorporate best available information for the data on the Boreal Caribou KMU range as well as population size, trend, or distribution data as it becomes available, into monitoring, follow-up, and adaptive management. Describe additional mitigation measures that may need to be implemented.</p> <p>d. Describe how mitigation measures for Boreal Caribou habitat disturbance considered the potential absence of data in parts a and b.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Identify any mitigation measures that account for the uncertainties identified in parts a and b. ii. Describe the follow-up, monitoring and adaptive management that will verify the effectiveness of mitigation measures and verify the predictions presented in the EIS.
--	--------------------------------	---	---	--	--

				Additional information is required on potential effects to Boreal Caribou and associated mitigation measures, including how any new information received will be considered.	
IAAC-167	ECCC-30	<p>1.4 Regulatory framework and the role of government</p> <p>2.4 Application of the precautionary approach</p> <p>4.3 Study strategy and methodology</p> <p>6.4 Mitigation measures</p>	<p>12.2.2.2 Species at Risk and Species of Conservation Concern</p> <p>12.4.2.4 Project Residual Effect for Change in Habitat</p> <p>12.5.2.2 Mitigation for Cumulative Effects</p> <p>Tables 12-13 and 12-14</p> <p>Amended Recovery Strategy for the Woodland Caribou (<i>Rangifer tarandus caribou</i>), Boreal Population, in Canada; Environment and Climate Change Canada (2019)</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that mitigation measures to avoid or lessen potential adverse effects on species and/or critical habitat listed under the SARA be identified and described, and be consistent with any applicable recovery strategy and action plans. The EIS Guidelines require that the significance of residual effects be presented after having established the technically and economically feasible mitigation measures to eliminate, reduce or control the adverse environmental effects as well as any restitution for damage to the environment through replacement restoration, compensation or other means. The measures will be specific, achievable, measurable, and verifiable, and be described in a manner that avoids ambiguity in intent or commitment, interpretation, and implementation. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to consider any government policies, resource management plans, planning or study initiatives pertinent to the Project and/or EA and their implications. The EIS Guidelines also require that in undertaking the environmental effects assessment, the proponent will use best available information and methods as well as the precautionary approach.</p> <p>The EIS states that as part of the mitigation measures for cumulative effects, the proponent will “Contribute to the identification and protection of critical habitat as part of existing and future federal and provincial SAR recovery strategies (i.e., woodland caribou)”. However, it is unclear what specific actions and mitigation measures will be applied.</p> <p>The EIS identifies that a minimum of 205 ha of disturbance will be added to the KMU (provincial boundaries) for Boreal Caribou as a result of Project activities: 51 ha of additive indirect habitat disturbance at Gordon site and 154 ha at the MacLellan site.</p> <p>While the entirety of the KMU is not currently identified as critical habitat within the Boreal Caribou Recovery Strategy, the KMU has the best available data for Boreal Caribou use of the landscape surrounding the Project (ECCC, 2019).</p> <p>The EIS indicated recent camera trap (April 2019) and aerial survey data have demonstrated current caribou use of the KMU, including within the RAA. The loss of 205 ha of Boreal Caribou habitat constitutes harm to the</p>	<p>a. Use the most geographically relevant data and best available information, in the context of caribou management ranges to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. provide mitigation measures to lessen or avoid effects to Boreal Caribou in the RAA for any new disturbance (i.e., outside of the existing anthropogenic footprint); and ii. provide all proposed mitigation measures that will be implemented, considering all feasible compensative mitigation measures (i.e., offsetting and the proposed methods to restore, enhance, rehabilitate or create caribou habitat) to lessen the residual effects to Boreal Caribou habitat loss. <p>b. Describe how potential residual effects to Boreal Caribou were considered in the conclusion of no significant effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p>

				<p>individuals of this population, which needs to be reflected in the determination of significance of effects. Habitat loss has not been addressed with specific mitigation measures. Mitigation measures could include compensative measures, such as offsetting and the proposed methods to restore, enhance, rehabilitate or create caribou habitat to lessen the residual effects to Boreal Caribou habitat loss.</p> <p>The EIS needs to describe the application of best available information and restitution for damage to the environment through replacement, restoration, compensation or other means. Additionally, unmitigated residual effects to Boreal Caribou habitat needs to be considered in the proponent's conclusion of no significant effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Information regarding the proposed mitigation is required to understand the potential residual effects of the Project on Boreal Caribou.</p>	
IAAC-168	ECCC-25	<p>6.4 Mitigation measures</p> <p>6.5 Significance of residual effects</p>	<p>12.4.2.3 Mitigation for Change in Habitat</p> <p>12.4.3.3 Mitigation</p> <p>12.4.4.3 Mitigation</p> <p>Table 12-16</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to identify and describe mitigation measures consistent with any applicable recovery strategy and action plans to avoid or lessen potential adverse effects on species and/or critical habitat listed under SARA. The EIS will also identify and describe mitigation measures to avoid or lessen adverse effects on listed COSEWIC species, and species harvested by Indigenous Groups. The EIS Guidelines require that the significance of residual effects of the Project on VCs are presented after having established the technically and economically feasible mitigation measures.</p> <p>The EIS indicates that SAR and SOCC are not uniquely susceptible to change in mortality risk during construction and operation phases of the Project in comparison to other species. This conclusion is not supported by the EIS as SAR and SOCC population health and sustainability are uniquely susceptible to changes in mortality, habitat, and health.</p> <p>The EIS identifies that the residual effects to wildlife through change to mortality risk is considered a "low" magnitude effect. However, a numeric range is not provided to define a low versus moderate versus high magnitude residual effect leading to a lack of clarity in understanding the magnitude of residual effect for SAR and SOCC, population health and mortality. Predicted mortality effects to species with populations at risk are of greater conservation concern and of potentially greater magnitude.</p>	<p>a. Describe the mitigation and adaptive management measures for each SAR, SOCC, and species of importance to Indigenous Groups that will be employed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. address direct, indirect, and cumulative effects; and ii. ensure that these effects are minimized or avoided. <p>b. Describe how the determination of "low" magnitude effect for mortality risk for wildlife and wildlife habitat considered SAR and SOCC, as effects to these species may have the potential to be greater in magnitude.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If SAR and SOCC were not included in the determination of significance and the low magnitude characterization for mortality risk, update the effects assessment to include these SAR and SOCC. ii. Describe how mitigation measures identified in part a are considered in the determination of magnitude of effects.

				<p>The EIS refers to general wildlife mitigation measures proposed to “limit effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat, including to migratory birds, SAR and SOCC, and species harvested by resource users”. However, specific mitigation measures are not proposed to avoid or lessen potential adverse effects that have been identified for SAR listed under SARA or assessed by COSEWIC, in accordance with Section 79(2) of SARA. SAR often require specific or additional mitigation to remove residual Project effects. Additionally, harvested species may need specific or additional mitigation to ensure continued traditional resource use.</p> <p>Additional information is required to understand the residual effects to SAR, including those assessed by COSEWIC, and species harvested by Indigenous Groups.</p>	
IAAC-169	CCN-85 SDFN-93	<p>5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p> <p>6.5 Significance of residual effects</p>	<p>12.1.5 Residual Effects Characterization</p> <p>12.1.6 Significance Definition</p> <p>12.4.5 Summary of Project Residual Environmental Effects on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>Tables 12-2 and 12-3</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS present any residual environmental effects, including those deemed small or insignificant, of the Project on the VCs identified in Section 6.3. The EIS is required to identify the criteria and terms used to assign significance ratings to any predicted adverse effects and contain clear and sufficient information to enable the review the proponent's analysis of the significance of effects. The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe changes to the availability or quality of resources used for traditional purposes, including wildlife and birds, and require that the EIS take into account the potential adverse impacts that may result from the residual and environmental effects.</p> <p>EIS Table 12-3 provides the definition of significant adverse residual effects “as one that threatens the long-term persistence or viability of a wildlife species in the RAA, including effects that are contrary or inconsistent with the goals, objectives, and activities of recovery strategies, action plans, and management plans”.</p> <p>In Tables 12-2 and 12-3, it is unclear how Project effect pathways considered the potential for negative effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups in the RAA, and how they were considered in the characterizing of residual effects and assessing the significance of those residual effects in terms of impacts to the exercise of rights in the RAA.</p> <p>This information is required to understand the residual effects and the assessment of significance of impacts to species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p>	<p>a. Describe how the residual effects characterization for wildlife and wildlife habitat (i.e., direction, magnitude, geographic extent, timing, frequency, duration, reversibility, and ecological and socio-economic context) considered the specific effects to species that are of significance or importance to Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>b. Considering the response to IAAC-161, describe how characterization of significance of residual effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat considered and incorporated the potential for effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups. If significance criteria did not include this consideration, update and provide the significance determination with this information.</p>

IAAC-170	CCN-131 ECCC-26 MCCN-102 MCCN-103 SDFN-152	8.0 Follow-up and Monitoring Programs	23.5.14 Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan Volume 5, Appendix H Lynn Lake Gold Project, Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Technical Modelling Report 6.0 Ecological Risk Assessment 6.4 Risk Characterization Table 6-1	<p>The EIS Guidelines state that the follow-up and monitoring programs will include specific details, such as the parameters to be measured, planned timing for follow-up studies, monitoring methods, reporting mechanisms, and an outline of ways that Indigenous Groups will be included in the development and implementation of the programs and plans. The EIS Guidelines also require details of the monitoring, including all interventions, regulatory instruments, characterization of monitoring activities, production of monitoring reports, and sharing of information.</p> <p>Additional information is required in the Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan and sub-plans to understand how mitigation measure effectiveness will be assessed and how assumptions and conclusions for Project effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat (including migratory birds and SAR) will be verified through follow-up and monitoring. For example, information related to the assessment mitigations for effects to migratory birds, SAR, wetland function, and wildlife health associated with release of cyanide and failure of TMF containment have not been included in the Wildlife and Tailings Management Facility sub-plan.</p> <p>The ERA (EIS Volume 5, Appendix H), evaluates “the potential that ecological receptors (i.e. mammals, birds, plants, fish) may experience adverse health effects as a result of exposure to chemical stressors”. The EIS presents the selected receptors in Table 6-1. Risk quotients (RQs) were calculated for baseline and future cases for COPCs (such as metals). The EIS indicates that “When the change in RQ or SR between Baseline Case and Future Case is greater than 1.0, there is a potential (but not a certainty) that adverse effects to the ecological receptor as a result of the Project may exist”. However the EIS does not provide a description of how future cases for exposures to COPCs will be monitored during the Project lifespan. It is unclear what monitoring and follow-up is proposed for COPC concentrations in various media (e.g., air, soil, water) and the potential effects to wildlife. Monitoring programs to evaluate and validate ERA predictions, and future scenarios need to be presented as they pertain to potential risks to wildlife health.</p> <p>This information is required to understand the follow-up and monitoring activities the proponent is proposing for wildlife and wildlife habitat and to understand how Indigenous Groups will be involved in the development and implementation of these programs.</p>	<p>a. For the Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan and sub-plans, provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the parameters to be measured; ii. planned timing for follow-up studies; iii. monitoring methods; and iv. reporting mechanisms for the follow-up and monitoring programs. <p>b. Identify specific monitoring and follow-up that will be conducted as part of the Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan to monitor for COPCs and validate the predicted future case scenarios for contaminants as identified in the ERA.</p> <p>c. Within the Avian Monitoring and Wildlife and Tailings Management Facility sub-plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Develop a plan with appropriate spatial and temporal scales to determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures in a timely manner. Provide the Wildlife and Tailings Management Facility sub-plan that covers all phases of the Project, including reclamation. ii. Describe the adaptive management framework that will allow mitigation measures to be adjusted if necessary. <p>d. Describe how Indigenous Groups will be involved in the development and implementation of the monitoring and follow-up activities described in parts a and b.</p>
----------	--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--

Socio-Economic Conditions					
IAAC-171	CCN-109 CCN-111 CCN-112 CCN-113 CCN-114 CCN-116 CCN-117 CCN-120 MCCN-59 MCCN-60 MCCN-62 MCCN-63 MCCN-64 MCCN-65 MCCN-66 MCCN-74 MCCN-95 MMF-29 SDFN-125 SDFN-126 SDFN-127 SDFN-130 SDFN-132 SDFN-133 SDFN-135 SDFN-136	4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge 5.0 Engagement with Indigenous groups and concerns raised 6.1.11 Human environment	13.2 Existing Conditions for Labour and Economy 13.9 Follow-up and Monitoring 14.2 Existing Conditions for Community Services, Infrastructure, and Wellbeing 19.2.2 Overview Table 19-3 Guidance Appendices to the Major Projects Assessment Standard – Appendix 1: Indigenous Socio-economic Impact Assessment (SEIA); First Nations Major Projects Coalition (2020)	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that baseline information reflect the health and socio-economic conditions affecting communities in the study area, including characterization of the functioning and health of the socio-economic environment, encompassing a broad range of matters that affect communities in the study area in a way that recognizes interrelationships, system functions, and vulnerabilities.</p> <p>Best practice guidance for the assessment of socio-economic impacts in relation to Indigenous peoples suggests an assessment of socio-economic conditions, such as “Indigenous demographic and other baseline data that is properly disaggregated from the overall local and/or regional population and must adequately represent individual Indigenous populations” (First Nations Major Projects Coalition, 2020).</p> <p>EIS Section 13.2 provides a detailed discussion and analysis of the regional conditions for labour force, employment, and economy; however there is no clear linkage to the actual socio-economic circumstances for Indigenous Groups relevant to these conditions. Data is presented throughout this section as amalgamated under ‘local’ or ‘regional’. Limitations with secondary statistical data is acknowledged, however, the assessment requires primary data collection from Indigenous Groups to obtain Project-specific information on the labour force, employment, and economy.</p> <p>Members of Indigenous Groups may choose to live and work within the LAA/RAA for health and socio-economic reasons or may travel to these areas to access services, temporary employment or harvest country foods.</p> <p>No information regarding effects on specific Indigenous Groups’ involvement in natural resource management and/or harvesting commercially, is provided. The assessment used information from other VCs, including current use; community services, infrastructure and wellbeing; and labour and economy. This information is required to understand the socio-economic conditions and specific Project impacts to each Indigenous Group.</p>	<p>a. Describe the data and rationale used to assess the socio-economic conditions of Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>b. Update the Indigenous socio-economic baseline with Indigenous Group-specific data, where possible. As applicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> identify the criteria used to assess socio-economic conditions; describe the involvement of each Indigenous Group in the regional commercial economy; identify any factors preventing access to employment or other economic opportunities; identify the socio-economic vulnerabilities of the economically marginalized; identify the general state of community well-being including the physical and mental health conditions; analyze access to (including potential pressures on) social services and protection facilities in the community; and identify existing infrastructure including access to roads, housing, and additional pressures on infrastructure. <p>c. Describe how Indigenous Group-specific socio-economic information is considered in the assessment of impacts to Indigenous people and their rights. Describe efforts made to engage with each Indigenous Group to inform the assessment.</p> <p>d. Update the effects assessments, as applicable, to include the information gathered in parts b and c. Identify any changes to the conclusions in the effects assessments and any additional mitigation measures, as necessary.</p>
IAAC-172	IAAC	6.1.11 Human environment	14.3 Project Interactions with	The EIS Guidelines require that health and socio-economic conditions of the current environment be described, including matters that affect	a. Describe how the Project can impact:

	SDFN-100	6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	Community Services, Infrastructure, and Wellbeing Community Services and Infrastructure	<p>communities in the study area in a way that recognizes interrelationships, system functions, and vulnerabilities (workers/job seekers and their families, youth, elders, women, service providers, economically marginalized members of the community). The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of how changes to the environment caused by the Project will affect socio-economic and health conditions of Indigenous peoples.</p> <p>The EIS notes that potential changes to community services and infrastructure will result from an in-migration of Project workers to the LAA. The EIS assumes that workers' families will not relocate to the LAA due to its remoteness, lack of amenities, and that most workers will operate on a fly-in-fly-out or drive-in-drive-out rotation.</p> <p>The EIS does not assess the impacts of non-local workers or the work camp to Indigenous women and girls. This consideration supports the mandate of the Commission for the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls and the recommendations made regarding resource-extraction and development industries to address and promote equality, safety and security for Indigenous women and girls.</p> <p>The EIS does not assess social health effects of the work camp on Indigenous workers.</p> <p>Additional information is required to understand the potential impacts of the work camp and in-migration of non-local and non-Indigenous workers to local Indigenous women and girls and the potential impacts of the work camp to the social well-being of Indigenous workers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indigenous women and girls in the RAA; and ii. social well-being of Indigenous workers at the work camp. <p>b. Provide mitigation measures to address the impacts identified in part a and any relevant follow-up and monitoring that may be required.</p>
IAAC-173	IAAC MCCN-62	6.1.11 Human environment 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples 8.0 Follow-Up and Monitoring Programs	13.9 Follow-Up and Monitoring 14.8 Follow-up and Monitoring 19.10 Follow-up and Monitoring	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that a follow-up program be designed to verify the accuracy of the effects assessment and to determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures. The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of community level changes to Indigenous peoples' socio-economic environment caused by the Project, such as economic activity.</p> <p>EIS Chapter 13 notes that follow-up and monitoring programs are not proposed for Project effects to labour and economy because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - effects are primarily positive, - adverse effects are anticipated to be low, and - effects are dependent on the extent to which others participate and are mostly out of the care and control of the proponent. 	<p>a. Describe socio-economic follow-up and monitoring programs for labour and economy to validate the predictions of the assessment, confirm the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and respond to any unanticipated effects identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Include information on adaptive management and associated triggers. ii. Describe any set targets for local Indigenous participation, monitoring of Indigenous persons employed by the Project, and mechanisms for adaptive management if targets are not met.

				<p>EIS Chapter 13 indicates that mitigation measures (such as training programs) could be adjusted based on the response or lack of response received from Indigenous Groups and community members. Additional information is required to understand how the proponent will monitor and adjust the proposed mitigation measures, such as training programs, to ensure that they are working as intended.</p> <p>EIS Section 14.8 notes that follow-up and monitoring programs are not required for community services, infrastructure, and wellbeing because “government departments, public agencies, and private-sector companies that deliver community services and infrastructure will monitor the ongoing demand for these services as part of their normal planning practices.” Although these organizations provide on-going support services to the community, they will not monitor the Project-specific socio-economic impacts nor monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed by the proponent.</p> <p>EIS Chapter 14 indicates that the proponent will continue to communicate with local communities and service providers with respect to scheduling so they may prepare for potential increased demands in local services and infrastructure. Additional information is required to understand how the proponent will confirm and evaluate predicted impacts to local services and infrastructure caused by the Project and which organizations that it will be working with to ensure adequate support for local community services and infrastructure are met.</p> <p>Information on follow-up and monitoring specific to the Project is required to validate the predictions of Project impacts to socio-economic conditions that may affect Indigenous peoples, confirm the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and understand the response to any unanticipated impacts identified.</p>	<p>b. Describe socio-economic follow-up and monitoring programs for community services, infrastructure, and wellbeing. Include key community services potentially impacted by the Project, organizations that will be included in the follow-up and monitoring programs, and mechanisms for adaptive management if unanticipated impacts are identified.</p> <p>c. Describe the plan to engage Indigenous Groups in the development and implementation of the programs outlined in parts a and b.</p>
Human Health					
IAAC-174	HC-06 MCCN-84	6.1 Project setting and baseline conditions 6.1.1 Atmospheric Environment	18.4.1 Analytical Assessment Techniques Volume 5, Appendix H Lynn Lake Gold Project, Human Health	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to provide baseline information in sufficient detail to identify how the Project could affect VCs and an analysis of those effects. Baseline information needs to consider historical mining activities at the Project site as a source of environmental effects (e.g., historical mine tailings and contamination and its management).</p> <p>The EIS presents the Baseline Case which “evaluates existing potential human health risks based upon measured data for existing COPC</p>	<p>a. Identify the historic mining activities that contribute to the baseline for COPCs.</p> <p>i. Describe how past contributions of mining may have contributed to existing COPCs through the pathways of impacts to human health identified in Section 18.4.1 of the EIS.</p>

		6.1.11 Human environment 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	and Ecological Risk Assessment Technical Modelling Report 4.1 Air 5.4.1 Non-carcinogenic Chemicals	<p>concentrations in air, soil, terrestrial plants, water, sediment, small mammals, and fish. COPC concentrations for wild meat (including moose, rabbit, beaver, duck, and terrestrial bird) were predicted based upon measured and modelled concentrations of COPC in other media". It is unclear how the EIS includes the impacts of previous mining activities and contribution to COPCs to the baseline. Identification of the impacts of previous mining is required for the development of adequate baseline information.</p> <p>The EIS states that "No Baseline Case concentrations were available for DPM, HCN, and metals, VOCs or PAHs." In the absence of baseline information for these COPCs, the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) only considers exposure to the Project's predicted atmospheric emissions in its characterization of potential human health risks. This may not reflect the total exposure to COPCs at the Project site, or at receptor sites. Baseline COPC data clarity is needed for pre-Project conditions, to understand the potential incremental exposures from Project construction, operation, and decommissioning.</p> <p>Creating a baseline case that relies on information from literature-based sources, historical databases, other projects, and other areas distant from the Project area, limits the representativeness of the baseline. A rationale for the use of information sources and their appropriateness for this situation is needed to understand the baseline case.</p> <p>In EIS Volume 5, Appendix H, a HQ of 1 was used for inhalation exposure. Where an HHRA evaluates only Project-related exposures (i.e., excluding background estimated daily intake for sources not related to the Project), a target HQ of less than or equal to 0.2 needs to be used to compensate for the exposures not taken into consideration. Without the use of this target HQ, it is unclear if the analysis underestimates health risks from exposure to COPCs in ambient air.</p> <p>Information on the Baseline Case, including how historic mining activities were considered, and the characterization of risks to human health is required to understand the baseline information and Project changes to the environment which will inform understanding of the effects assessment.</p>	<p>ii. If additional COPCs are identified as contributing to the baseline, update the HHRA and human health assessment to include this baseline data.</p> <p>b. Provide baseline data for all COPCs in ambient air at the MacLellan and Gordon mining sites. Where baseline data are measured, document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the type of samples collected; ii. the number of samples collected; iii. the analytical detection limit; iv. the number of samples with non-detectable COPC concentrations; v. the minimum and maximum COPC concentrations; and vi. any statistical averaging (e.g., 95% upper confidence limit mean) used to represent the baseline COPC concentrations in each environmental medium. <p>c. Update the characterization of risks from COPCs using a HQ target of 0.2 for inhalation exposure. Where appropriate, provide justification for alternative HQs that are used to characterize risk from the inhalation of COPCs.</p>
IAAC-175	CCN-106 CCN-108 CCN-111	4.2.2 Community knowledge and	19.2.2 Overview	The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to describe how input from Indigenous Groups, including Aboriginal traditional knowledge, was used to establish baseline health conditions, including human health-related socio-economic	a. Describe the criteria used to assess Indigenous health conditions.

<p>CCN-112 CCN-113 CCN-123</p> <p>MCCN-94 MCCN-95 MCCN-96</p> <p>SDFN-124 SDFN-126 SDFN-127 SDFN-128 SDFN-129 SDFN-139 SDFN-147</p>	<p>Aboriginal traditional knowledge</p> <p>5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised</p> <p>6.1.9 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>19.5.2 Changes to Indigenous Health Conditions</p> <p>19.5.4.1 Cumulative Effect Pathways</p> <p>19.5.4.3 Cumulative Effects</p> <p>19.9.3.8 Sayisi Dene First Nation</p> <p>Tables 19-2 and 19-4</p> <p>Useful Information for Environmental Assessments; HC (2010)</p>	<p>parameters. The EIS Guidelines also require that the EIS assess Project effects to Indigenous health conditions for each Indigenous Group. The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to engage with each Indigenous Group, to obtain and incorporate their views on effects of changes to the environment on Aboriginal peoples, including health conditions.</p> <p>HC's Useful Information for Environmental Assessments indicates that for assessing the appropriate baseline information relevant to human health, information on Indigenous Groups is required to adequately assess potential health effects caused by the Project. This baseline information includes: location of communities in relation to the Project, size of the population(s) potentially affected, presence of drinking water intakes, recreational water use, country food harvesting, consumption of country foods and intake rates, and incorporation of traditional and local knowledge for exposure assumptions (i.e., the location of traditional resource use).</p> <p>The EIS does not provide an assessment of Project effects to Indigenous health conditions for each Indigenous Group. The assessment of Project effects on Indigenous health conditions was limited to conducting a HHRA from combined exposure to COPCs found in multiple media.</p> <p>Information is required to understand the accuracy and representativeness of baseline information, to determine the Project's potential effects to Indigenous health conditions for each Indigenous Group.</p> <p>The EIS states that "Residual environmental effects to Indigenous health, through effects to air, water, and soil quality, as well as consumptive resources (country foods) are anticipated during the construction and operation phase of the Project. This in turn could lead to effects on the ability to exercise Indigenous or Treaty rights. However, these environmental effects are not anticipated at population levels to plant, animal, and fish species, including those harvested as country foods within the Indigenous Health RAA." The EIS concludes that, "Cumulative effects on Indigenous health conditions are expected to be adverse and low in magnitude as the harvest of country foods will be able to continue with minor alteration of behavior such as changes in patterns of access or travel routes", however, this conclusion does not include baseline information.</p> <p>Current use and effects to current use are listed as effect pathways for Indigenous health conditions. However, current use baseline has not been</p>	<p>b. Provide a summary of input, from the perspective of each Indigenous Group, on baseline health conditions.</p> <p>c. Describe the baseline health conditions of each Indigenous Group. Where appropriate, include human health-related socio-economic parameters.</p> <p>i. Update the Project effects assessment on Indigenous health conditions for each Indigenous Group, including any changes to the HHRA in response to IAAC-174 to IAAC-183.</p> <p>d. Update the cumulative effects assessment for Indigenous health considering the Project effects in combination with future foreseeable projects.</p> <p>i. Describe how Project effects will combine with specific developments or other cumulative effects sources to affect environmental conditions that support community health.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

				<p>completed for several Indigenous Groups and therefore the assessment on Indigenous health may not be accurate.</p> <p>This information is required to understand the health impacts to each Indigenous Group.</p>	
IAAC-176	MCCN-83 MCCN-86 MCCN-106 MCCN-107	6.1 Project setting and baseline conditions 6.1.9 Indigenous peoples	18.2.1 Methods 18.4.1 Analytical Assessment Techniques	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe the baseline conditions for human health and how changes to the environment caused by the Project will affect the health of Indigenous peoples, including changes to air and water quality, and country foods. Baseline information must be provided in sufficient detail to enable the identification of how the Project could affect VCs and an analysis of those effects.</p> <p>The EIS notes that Baseline Case concentrations of COPCs in the soil, terrestrial vegetation, small mammals, water, sediment, and fish were based on samples collected from the LAA within the Gordon and MacLellan regions. It is not clear if the sampled species were representative of those used/consumed by the Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>Traditional medicines, plants, and animals are not identified among baseline samples. This information is required because impacts to traditional medicines, plants, and animals impact Indigenous health.</p> <p>The EIS states that “Baseline Case metal concentrations in small mammals were based on the maximum concentration of individual metals from three red-backed voles and three deer mice collected in the Gordon region” and that Baseline Case metal concentrations in traditional plants were based on 61 samples and seven field duplicates collected throughout the Gordon region in 2015 and 2016.</p> <p>Samples collected for the assessment need to be verified as traditional use species relied on by Indigenous Groups to ensure the Baseline Case is representative.</p> <p>Additional information is required to confirm if the “traditional species” being tested for contaminants are appropriate relative to the harvesting and consumption patterns of each Indigenous Group to understand the impacts to Indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>a. Confirm with each Indigenous Group that the species used in the Baseline Case for COPCs for traditionally harvested plants and animals are consistent with species of use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. If required, update the Baseline Case to reflect species used by the Indigenous Groups, or provide a rationale for how the traditionally used plant and animal species used in the Baseline Case allow for a robust understanding of the potential effects of COPCs on Indigenous people. ii. Update the effects assessment to include information gathered from the Indigenous Groups, identify any changes to the conclusions of the effects assessments, and identify any additional mitigation measures, as necessary.

IAAC-177	MCCN-87 MCCN-88	6.1 Project setting and baseline conditions	18.4.1 Analytical Assessment Techniques	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe the baseline conditions for human health and how changes to the environment caused by the Project will affect the health of Indigenous peoples, including changes to air and water quality, and country foods. Baseline information is required in sufficient detail to enable the identification of how the Project could affect VCs and an analysis of those effects.</p> <p>The EIS states that “receptors are assumed to not obtain fish from Farley Lake (immediately downstream of the Project) based on feedback from local residents and Indigenous people” and that “Receptors were assumed to obtain 10% of the fish they consume on a yearly basis from Swede Lake (for Gordon region receptors) or Cockeram Lake (for MacLellan region receptors). This is considered conservative as the results of community and Indigenous engagement suggest that people are unlikely to obtain fish from either of those waterbodies due to perceived contamination of surface water related to historical mining activities”. It is unclear whether this assumption is verified.</p> <p>Additional information from Indigenous Groups is required to clarify the assumptions about the locations and amounts of fish harvested for consumption in the Project area to verify the predictions outlined in the EIS on Indigenous health.</p>	<p>a. Verify the assumptions made about fish harvesting percentages and locations with Indigenous Groups.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirm that Indigenous Groups do not obtain fish from Farley Lake. ii. If the assumptions are incorrect, update the effects assessment with appropriate harvesting information.
IAAC-178	MCCN-80	6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	18.1.3 Potential Effects, Pathways and Measurable Parameters Table 18-1	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe impacts to human health, focusing on effects on health outcomes or risks in consideration of current and future availability of country foods.</p> <p>In the EIS, backyard garden produce is combined with country foods as an effect pathway for ingestion of COPCs. Backyard garden produce and country foods are not equivalent when assessing potential impacts to Indigenous Groups that may be harvesting country foods in the vicinity of, or downstream from the Project (i.e., impacts to Indigenous health, location of resource, ability to exercise rights).</p> <p>This information is required to understand the potential effects of the Project on the health of Indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>a. Provide an updated effects assessment for human health to include backyard garden produce and country foods as separate effect pathways.</p> <p>b. Provide mitigation measures, monitoring, and follow-up programs, as necessary, to address any additional effects identified in the updated assessment.</p>
IAAC-179	HC-07	6.1.11 Human environment	Volume 5, Appendix H Lynn Lake Gold Project, Human Health	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe the baseline conditions for human health and how changes to the environment caused by the Project will affect the health of Indigenous peoples, including from changes to air and water quality, and country foods.</p>	<p>a. Provide a multi-media approach in the HHRA for those COPCs that are present in several media and/or act on the same target organ(s) and/or</p>

		6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	and Ecological Risk Assessment Technical Modelling Report 5.4 Risk Characterization Tables 5-9 to 5-16	<p>The HHRA currently addresses exposures through three environmental media and their associated risks separately, which has the potential to underestimate health risks from combined exposure to COPCs found in multiple media. All potential routes of exposure must be considered or a clear rationale provided for their exclusion, in a HHRA. Where potential human exposure to COPCs occurs in more than one environmental medium (e.g., air, soil, and foods), a multi-media approach for evaluating exposure is considered appropriate. A multi-media assessment effectively considers the potential for additive toxicity due to chemicals that act on the same target organ(s) and/or share common mechanisms of action. Similar target organs/tissues/modes of action were identified in EIS Tables 5-9 to 5-16, but their additive potential was not considered as part of the HHRA.</p> <p>This information is required to understand the full potential for related health risks from the proposed Project as there are uncertainties from combined exposure to COPCs found in multiple media.</p>	<p>share common mechanisms of action.</p> <p>b. Based on the results of the updated HHRA, provide mitigation measures, monitoring, and follow-up programs, as necessary.</p>
IAAC-180	HC-08	6.1.11 Human environment 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	Volume 5, Appendix H Lynn Lake Gold Project, Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Technical Modelling Report 5.1.1.4 Specific Assumptions for the Off-Duty Worker Receptor 5.2.2.1 Inhalation Exposures	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe the baseline conditions for human health and how changes to the environment caused by the Project will affect the health of Indigenous peoples, including changes to air and water quality and country foods.</p> <p>The HHRA applies dose averaging in its characterization of potential health risks (e.g., off-duty workers), which has the potential to underestimate risks to health. EIS Section 5.2.2.1 in Volume 5, Appendix H, considers short-term exposure to COPCs and uses dose averaging (i.e., mathematically spreading out a short-duration dose over a longer period) to characterize the exposure of off-duty workers. Dose averaging assumes toxicity to be linearly proportional to the magnitude and duration of exposure, which may not be true depending on how the toxicological reference value (TRV) was derived. As such, this approach should always be supported by appropriate scientific rationale on a chemical-specific basis (with supporting TRVs—acute, subchronic, chronic) to indicate why it is adequately protective of human health for the exposure period considered.</p> <p>Without this information, there are uncertainties as to the potential risks to health of off-duty workers, a portion of which are anticipated to be Indigenous.</p>	<p>a. Provide scientific rationale, on a chemical-specific basis, (with supporting TRVs—acute, subchronic, chronic) to indicate why the dose averaging approach used in the HHRA is adequately protective of human health for the exposure period considered.</p>

IAAC-181	IAAC	2.4 Application of the precautionary approach 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	14.4.2.1 Project Pathways 18.4.1. Analytical Assessment Techniques	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to provide information on the potential effects to the health of Indigenous people, with a focus on effects on health outcomes or risks in consideration of potential changes to air quality, noise exposure, and effects of vibration. The EIS Guidelines state that the EIS will demonstrate that all aspects of the Project have been examined in a careful and precautionary manner in order to avoid significant adverse effects.</p> <p>It is anticipated that Indigenous Peoples are expected to make up a portion of the work force at the Project site.</p> <p>The EIS notes that there are inhalation health risks that exceed the applicable benchmark at the work camp for off-duty workers, but that the frequency of exceedances is low and therefore negligible.</p> <p>EIS Section 14.4.2.1 notes that during the construction phase, most Project workers will work three weeks on and one week off and that during operation, Project workers are assumed to be on two weeks on and two weeks off or four weeks on and four weeks off rotations.</p> <p>The assumption used for off-duty worker receptors for human health is based on a two weeks on, two weeks off shift rotation. No explanation is provided as to why this shift rotation was chosen instead of the three weeks on, one week off shift rotation. Exposure to inhalation health risks to off-duty workers could be underestimated using this assumption in the human health assessment.</p> <p>Information on the rationale for the shift rotation used in the human health assessment is required to understand the impacts to human health.</p>	<p>a. Explain why the two weeks on, two weeks off shift rotation assumption was used in the human health assessment instead of the three weeks on, one week off rotation.</p> <p>b. Describe any changes to the results of the human health assessment for off-duty workers using the three weeks on, one week off shift rotation assumption versus the two weeks on, two weeks off shift rotation. If required, identify new mitigation measures based on results of any changes to the human health assessment.</p>
IAAC-182	CCN-29 CCN-30 CCN-31 CCN-32 CCN-33 CCN-34 CCN-35 CCN-36 CCN-37 CCN-38 IAAC	5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised 6.3.4 Indigenous Peoples 6.5 Significance of residual effects	6.4.1.4 Project Residual Effects 18.7.1 Significance of Project Residual Effects	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to provide information on the potential impacts to the health of Indigenous people. The EIS Guidelines also require that the EIS will demonstrate that all aspects of the Project have been examined and planned in a careful and precautionary manner in order to avoid significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The EIS notes that according to Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards, there will be occasional future case exceedances of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), diesel particulate matter (DPM), and sulphur dioxide (SO₂). The EIS also notes that according to the Manitoba Ambient Air Quality Criteria, there will occasional future case exceedances of carbon monoxide (CO), total</p>	<p>a. Describe how the potential Indigenous receptors were identified and how they relate to locations of importance in the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p> <p>b. Describe how Indigenous Groups will be notified of the anticipated exceedances and how unexpected and unpredicted exceedances will be communicated, throughout the life of the Project.</p> <p>c. Identify how the “additional investigation to further characterize potential human health risks”</p>

	MCCN-89 SDFN-27 SDFN-33 SDFN-34 SDFN-35 SDFN-36 SDFN-37 SDFN-38 SDFN-39 SDFN-40 SDFN-41 SDFN-42			<p>suspended particles (TSP), and respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than 10 µm (PM₁₀).</p> <p>The EIS states that predicted exceedances in inhalation exposures are expected to be infrequent, based on single events, and are not continuous exposures that would represent potential concerns for Indigenous health.</p> <p>To characterize potential human health risks, the assessment considers the magnitude and frequency of these exceedances as well as the pattern of exceedances. These exceedances are not an indication that human health effects will occur rather, they are an indication that additional investigation is required to further characterize potential human health risks.</p> <p>These exceedances can extend beyond the Project footprint into unoccupied Crown land for multiple kilometres and vary in duration and location.</p> <p>The proponent’s assumption that inhalation exposure would be based on single event may not be accurate, if the Indigenous Groups are using the LAA to exercise their Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>. Additional information on TLRU will inform the assessment of Project impacts.</p> <p>Information is required to assess potential Project impacts to Indigenous health based on occasional exceedances. Additional information on the Indigenous Groups’ land use and occupancy patterns is required to understand and assess the potential impacts of these exceedances on Indigenous health.</p>	<p>associated with these exceedances will be triggered and how it will take place.</p> <p>d. Identify and assess the linkages between effects to air quality and potential impacts (tangible and intangible) to Indigenous Groups on use of lands for traditional purposes and potential impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p>
IAAC-183	HC-05 IAAC MCCN-86	<p>5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised</p> <p>6.1 Project setting and baseline conditions</p> <p>6.1.11 Human environment</p>	<p>18.4.1 Analytical Assessment Techniques</p> <p>18.4.2.1 Project Pathways</p> <p>19.2.2.1 Indigenous Health Conditions</p> <p>19.4 Assessment of Residual</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe the baseline conditions for human health and how changes to the environment caused by the Project will affect the health of Indigenous peoples, including changes to air and water quality, and country foods.</p> <p>The EIS presents HQs that exceed the 0.2 target value under both the Baseline Case and Future Case scenarios, for a number of receptors. The exceedances were attributed to manganese in traditional plants; methylmercury in fish; and thallium in wild meat, traditional plants, and garden produce, for both scenarios. The HHRA states that “The changes in HQ between Baseline Case and Future Case for manganese, methylmercury and thallium were less than the benchmark of 0.2 indicating Project-related health risks are negligible.” However, the target HQ of 0.2 is designed to</p>	<p>a. Provide details on the risk characterization of Baseline Case and Future Case scenarios for manganese, methylmercury, and thallium, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. a comparison of both scenarios in absolute terms rather than based on a change in HQ; ii. a description of assumptions used, sources of uncertainty and conservatism; iii. identifying the potential source or contributor to any increase in characterized risk between scenarios; and

		6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	Environmental Effects on Indigenous Peoples 19.4.3.3 Residual Effects Volume 5, Appendix H Lynn Lake Gold Project, Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Technical Modelling Report 5.4.5 Human Health Risks via Ingestion of Food	<p>indicate a negligible health risk for the Baseline plus Project scenario. By applying the HQ of 0.2 to the Project only scenario, absolute health risks are underestimated where baseline levels are already elevated.</p> <p>EIS Section 19.2.2.1 identified the HQ for total ingestion exposure to manganese, methylmercury, and thallium as currently above HC benchmarks and this is attributed to the consumption of fish and traditional plants harvested from within the RAA.</p> <p>Project related changes in air, water, and country food quality may affect the health of Indigenous peoples who live within the RAA and who may engage in hunting, trapping, fishing, and recreational activities. The EIS notes that Baseline Case concentrations of COPCs in the soil, terrestrial vegetation, small mammals, water, sediment, and fish were based on samples collected from the LAA within the Gordon and MacLellan regions. It is not clear if the sampled species were representative of those used/consumed by Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>The EIS notes the Future Case (Baseline Case contamination plus anticipated Project effects) is also anticipated to have levels of manganese, methylmercury, and thallium which are above the total ingestion benchmarks set by HC for toddlers. On occasion, Indigenous peoples may ingest water directly from the lakes located in their particular region; however, these occurrences are expected to be infrequent based on the results of engagement. This conclusion is based on limited information, as it is unknown the frequency in which Indigenous Groups ingest water directly from the lakes and rivers.</p> <p>Additional information on the method of assessment, as well as proposed monitoring, mitigation, engagement with Indigenous Groups, and management of these HQ target value exceedances is required to complete a review of health risks associated with the potential contamination of country foods and water.</p>	<p>iv. consideration of additional mitigation and monitoring to manage the potential increased health risks.</p> <p>b. Describe plans to engage with each Indigenous Group to verify the potential ingestion exposures. If required, update the effects assessment with any new information that is provided, and identify new mitigation measures.</p> <p>c. Demonstrate that the potential exceedances have been communicated and shared with each Indigenous Group.</p>
Physical and Cultural Heritage; Sites of Significance					
IAAC-184	CCN-110 CCN-112 CCN-113 MCCN-67	4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge	16.0 Heritage Resources 19.1.5 Significance Definition	The EIS Guidelines require an analysis for each Indigenous Group of how changes to the environment resulting from the Project will affect the physical and cultural heritage; and structures, sites or things of historical, archaeological, paleontological or architectural significance to groups, including intangible cultural heritage values such as sacred areas, cultural landscapes, language use and transmission.	a. Provide updated Project-specific baseline data for physical and cultural heritage resources in the PDA, LAA, and RAA. Describe how Indigenous Groups were involved / will be involved in the gathering of this information.

	MCCN-95 SDFN-126	5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised 6.1.9 Indigenous peoples 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	19.2.2 Overview 19.4.5 Change in Indigenous Physical and Cultural Heritage Table 19-3	<p>CEAA 2012 <i>Technical Guidance for Assessing Physical and Cultural Heritage or any Structure, Site or Thing 2014</i> identifies the need for consultation with Indigenous Groups when characterizing the effects of any changes to the environment resulting from the Project on the community's intangible and tangible heritage resources.</p> <p>The EIS provides limited baseline information on heritage resources and no discussion on Indigenous Groups' cultural heritage values or resources of important historical cultural significance in the PDA, LAA, and RAA. There is limited use of traditional knowledge information in the characterization of heritage resources. The information provided in the EIS is amalgamated and is not assessed separately for each Indigenous Group. It also appears that the physical and cultural heritage resources assessment relied on other VCs. The EIS notes that there are no known cultural or spiritual sites at either mine location.</p> <p>Additional information on physical and cultural heritage resources, including intangible cultural heritage values is required to understand impacts to Indigenous Groups and their rights.</p>	<p>b. Identify the criteria used to assess the effect of any change on the environment to Indigenous physical and cultural heritage. Update the effects assessments based on any newly identified sites of Indigenous physical and cultural heritage.</p> <p>c. Describe mitigation and monitoring proposed to prevent or address potential impacts to sites of physical and cultural importance during all phases of the Project. Consider providing this information as a plan.</p> <p>d. Describe how input from each Indigenous Group was considered in parts a, b, and c.</p>
IAAC-185	IAAC	6.3.4 Indigenous peoples 6.4 Mitigation measures	16.4 Assessment of Residual Environmental Effects on Heritage Resources 16.5 Assessment of Cumulative Environmental Effects on Heritage Resources 16.7 Determination of Significance 16.9 Follow-up and Monitoring	<p>The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of Project effects to physical and cultural heritage, and structures, sites or things of historical archaeological, paleontological or architectural significance, including from the loss or destruction of those sites or things.</p> <p>The EIS concludes that there are no residual and cumulative effects to heritage resources because changes to this VC are not anticipated. The EIS also notes that there is low potential for Project activities to interact with unidentified heritage resources. An outline of the Heritage and Cultural Resources Protection Plan is provided. It is not clear how this plan will prevent all impacts to heritage resources. Rationale is missing on how the proponent reached the conclusion that there are no residual effects to heritage resources.</p> <p>Additional information is required to understand how the proponent concluded that there are no residual effects to heritage resources.</p>	<p>a. Clarify the assessment conclusion (no residual or low potential for residual effects) for heritage resources, including a rationale for the conclusion. Update the cumulative effects assessment as required.</p>

			23.5.11 Heritage and Cultural Resources Protection Plan		
IAAC-186	IAAC	3.2.2 Valued components to be examined 5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised	17.3 Project Interaction with Current use of Land and Resources for traditional Purposes 17.4 Assessment of Residual Environmental Effects on Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that VCs refer to environmental biophysical or human features that may be impacted by the Project. The value of a component relates to its role in the ecosystem and the value people place on it and may be identified as having scientific, social, cultural, economic, historical, archaeological or aesthetic importance.</p> <p>The EIS notes that there are no known cultural or spiritual sites at either mine location. The EIS notes that the evaluation of potential Project effects on the cultural landscape was based on information obtained from Indigenous community members from one Indigenous Group, who were asked to identify any cultural or spiritual areas within the Gordon and MacLellan site PDAs/LAAs and within the RAA.</p> <p>Proponent engagement activities with all of the Indigenous Groups are on-going. There are also outstanding TLRU studies from “most” affected Indigenous Groups. This information will inform if there are sites of cultural or historical significance within the RAA, PDA, and LAA.</p> <p>Additional information is required from Indigenous Groups on sites of importance that may exist in the Project area to be able to understand the impacts to these sites.</p>	<p>a. Provide updated, Project-specific baseline data for cultural and spiritual sites in the PDA, LAA, and RAA. Update the effects assessment with this information and identify any mitigation measures as required.</p> <p>b. Provide mitigation measures and the procedures the proponent will follow should a site of cultural or spiritual significance be discovered/disclosed throughout the life of the Project.</p> <p>c. Identify how information from each Indigenous Group was considered in the identification of cultural and spiritual sites, and the development of proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>d. Describe how the proponent plans to engage with Indigenous Groups to verify potential impacts to cultural and spiritual sites. If required, update the effects assessment with any new information that is provided, and identify new mitigation measures.</p>
Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes					
IAAC-187	CCN-80 CCN-81 CCN-83 CCN-87 CCN-91 CCN-101 IAAC MCCN-51 MCCN-58	3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries 5.0 Engagement With Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised 6.1.11 Human environment	4.3.4.4 Assessment of Cumulative Environmental Effects 13.1.4.1 Spatial Boundaries 17.1.5 Boundaries	<p>The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of Project effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, and information to support the assessment of impacts to rights. The EIS Guidelines require that spatial boundaries will be defined taking into account the appropriate scale and spatial extent of potential environmental effects, community knowledge, Aboriginal traditional knowledge, current or TLRU by Indigenous Groups, and ecological, technical, social, and cultural considerations.</p> <p>In the EIS, the spatial boundaries for the assessment of current use were developed by considering the spatial extent of the LAAs or RAAs for relevant VCs.</p>	<p>a. Identify how information from each Indigenous Group was considered in the selection of all spatial and temporal boundaries for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>b. Identify and describe any disparity between the views of Indigenous Groups and the proponent on the selection of spatial and temporal boundaries for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, efforts made to reconcile the disparities, and rationale for conclusions on matter for which disparity in views remains.</p>

	MCCN-61 MCCN-70 SDFN-88 SDFN-89 SDFN-91 SDFN-97 SDFN-114		17.2.13 Indigenous Communities	<p>The EIS notes that the LAA includes components of the PDA plus a 1 km buffer surrounding each component. The LAA was established to consider the area in which Project activities could have direct or indirect effects on current use because traditional practices rely on the resources assessed in wildlife and wildlife habitat, vegetation and wetlands, and surface water.</p> <p>The EIS states that the RAA, confirmed by one Indigenous Group, for current use aligns with the spatial boundary selected for wildlife and wildlife habitat because the Indigenous Groups rely on moose and the area also covers a broad range of mobile species used for traditional purposes.</p> <p>The EIS notes that twenty-five years was chosen as the temporal boundary for considering impacts of a change in the environment on Indigenous people because knowledge about traditional practices or locales may be lost or may not be passed on to younger members of the community if it goes unused for a generation.</p> <p>It is not clear if input from each Indigenous Group was solicited and considered in the identification of the PDA, LAA or the temporal boundaries.</p> <p>Additional information is required to ensure that the spatial and temporal boundaries reflect the respective patterns of current use and interest of Indigenous Groups and will support the assessment of potential impacts to Indigenous peoples and their rights.</p>	
IAAC-188	CCN-08 CCN-91 CCN-97 IAAC MCCN-69 SDFN-08 SDFN-104 SDFN-109 SDFN-110	2.3 Engagement with Indigenous groups 4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge 5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised	2.8 Emissions Discharges and Wastes 15.4.3.2 Mitigation 17.1.3.4 Anticipated Project Effects Identified by Indigenous Communities	<p>The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of changes to the environment that affect the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, including how these changes may affect conditions that support traditional use and practices. The EIS Guidelines requires the assessment of Project effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(c) of CEAA 2012. The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to engage Indigenous Groups and obtain and incorporate views in the EIS.</p> <p>EIS Chapters 15 and 17 identify potential effects pathways for the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. Intangible values associated with traditional use or practices are not included.</p>	<p>a. Identify and assess the pathways of effects between Project environmental effects and intangible values. Identify how information from each Indigenous Group was solicited in the selection of intangible values and in assessing potential Project effects.</p> <p>i. Update the effects assessment with this information and identify any mitigation measures as required.</p>

			17.1.4 Potential Effects, Pathways and Measurable Parameters	<p>EIS Section 17.1.4 discusses intangible values related to beliefs, perceptions, values, and qualitative experience, but does not evaluate the Project impacts to these intangible values. The proponent notes that given the subjective and conditional nature of intangible values, these potential impacts are considered only when an Indigenous Group has identified a related concern and that these intangible effects are best identified by Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>The assessment of Project impacts on current use is incomplete without the input of Indigenous Groups on effects to intangible values.</p> <p>Additional information is needed to identify, assess, and mitigate potential impacts of the Project on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes and associated impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p>	
IAAC-189	<p>CCN-16 CCN-23 CCN-25 CCN-26 CCN-78 CCN-83 CCN-87 CCN-88 CCN-89 CCN-90</p> <p>IAAC MMF-05</p> <p>SDFN-17 SDFN-25 SDFN-29 SDFN-86 SDFN-91 SDFN-101 SDFN-102 SDFN-103</p>	<p>3.1 Project components</p> <p>3.2 Project activities</p> <p>3.2.2 Valued components to be examined</p> <p>3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries</p> <p>6.1.4.1 Riparian, Wetland and Terrestrial Environments</p> <p>6.1.9 Indigenous peoples</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>2.3.2.3 Utilities and Infrastructure</p> <p>3.3.5.12 Sayisi Dene First Nation</p> <p>Appendix 3A Community Engagement Plan Table 1</p> <p>12.1.4.1 Spatial Boundaries</p> <p>12.4.2.3 Mitigation for Change in Habitat</p> <p>12.10 Summary of Commitments</p> <p>15.4.3.2 Mitigation</p> <p>17.1.5.1</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the assessment of Project effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(c) of CEAA 2012. The assessment is to include any changes to access and perceived access into areas used for traditional purposes and changes that could detract from use of the area or lead to avoidance, as a result of the Project and associated (actual and perceived) disturbance of the environment. The EIS Guidelines require that spatial boundaries are defined considering the appropriate scale and spatial extent of current or traditional land resource use by Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>EIS Section 19.4.3.1 notes that the Project may initiate a change in access patterns or routes used to travel to harvesting locations. For example, clearing of natural vegetation or earthworks, including digging of channels or infilling of ponds, may restrict or prevent travel. Increased Project-related traffic also has the potential to effect travel along roads within the LAA and RAA, and the new distribution line required for the MacLellan site may alter access conditions.</p> <p>The LAA for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes (1 km buffer surrounding each Project component) aligns with the LAA established for wildlife and wildlife habitat and vegetation and wetlands. However, there will also be a continuously defined prohibited zone around the Project where access will be prohibited.</p>	<p>a. Calculate the area of unoccupied Crown Land that will be made unavailable for the practice of Aboriginal and Treaty rights due to the Project and all associated activities, including areas where firearms use is prohibited.</p> <p>b. Identify any mitigation (e.g., signage, firearms discharge restrictions) for other VCs that may contribute to reduced access to resources for Indigenous Groups exercising their Section 35 Rights under the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>. Consider response to (Round 1 Package 1, IAAC-07) in this response.</p> <p>c. Provide a preliminary plan for access to lands beyond disturbed areas for travel routes that will be intersected by the PDA and related infrastructure.</p>

			<p>Spatial Boundaries</p> <p>19.2.2.2 Indigenous Socio-Economic Conditions</p> <p>19.4.3.1 Effect Pathways</p>	<p>EIS Section 12.4.2.3 notes that a wildlife mitigation measure will “Design for restriction of unauthorized access to habitat adjacent to the PDA.” This design mitigation measure prevents access to lands adjacent to the PDA restricting Indigenous Groups from accessing unoccupied Crown land to which they have a right of access and increasing the amount of lands taken up by the Project. This loss of territory must be considered, calculated, and assessed as it may result in additional impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p> <p>During the life of the Project, Indigenous hunters will be required to observe provincial regulations regarding the distance a firearm can be lawfully discharged from a mine site, roads, and other Project infrastructure. Areas where there is a firearms discharge prohibition are areas of unoccupied Crown land the Indigenous Groups will not be able to hunt on.</p> <p>Discussion of displacement of Indigenous Groups’ ability to access species which are disrupted in the LAA or to access wetlands that will not be functioning for 10-50 years following closure is absent in the EIS. The EIS also does not include the land use preferences of rights holders and their perceptions on impacts to access.</p> <p>Indigenous travel routes used to access lakes within the LAA have been identified that intersect with the MacLellan PDA and the Gordon Lake access road.</p> <p>Information on how the Project PDA and LAA will affect Indigenous Groups’ access to Crown land and areas of use around or beyond the PDA, including information on the size, scope, and nature of the prohibited zone, is required to understand impacts to Indigenous Groups’ practice of their Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p>	
IAAC-190	IAAC	6.1.9 Indigenous peoples	19.2.2.2 Indigenous Socio-Economic Conditions	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that baseline information for current use of lands and resources will focus on the traditional activity (i.e., hunting, fishing, trapping, plant gathering, and cultural practices) and include a characterization of the attributes of the activity that may be affected by Project-related changes to the environmental and socio-economic change. The EIS Guidelines require baseline information for health and socio-economic conditions that will include the functioning and health of the socio-economic environment, encompassing a broad range of matters that affect communities in the study area in a way that recognizes</p>	<p>a. Identify which traplines are in active use.</p> <p>b. Identify and describe potential tangible and intangible Project effects on trapping. Identify mitigation or accommodation measures for these effects. Describe engagement with the registered trapline holders and Indigenous trappers to identify the Project effects.</p>

				<p>interrelationships, system functions, and vulnerabilities, including commercial activities (e.g., fishing, trapping, hunting, forestry, outfitting).</p> <p>The EIS notes that the Indigenous socio-economic conditions LAA overlaps 19 permitted traplines in the Registered Trapline Districts of Pukatawagan and Southern Indian Lake all of which have had trapper permits; however, it is unknown if they are currently in active use. Six of these traplines are within 1.5 km of the PDA for the Gordon and MacLellan sites or the stretch of PR 391 between the Gordon site access road and the MacLellan site access road.</p> <p>The collection of additional Indigenous trapping knowledge is required to identify and understand potential community specific Project issues and potential impacts to Indigenous people and their rights.</p>	<p>c. Where applicable, update the effects assessment related to trapping, for current use of land and resources for traditional purposes and the assessment of potential impacts on the rights of Indigenous people, based on the information provided in parts a and b.</p>
IAAC-191	<p>CCN-44 CCN-45 CCN-46 CCN-47 CCN-48 CCN-49 CCN-50 CCN-51</p> <p>MCCN-22 MCCN-35</p> <p>SDFN-52 SDFN-53 SDFN-54 SDFN-55 SDFN-56 SDFN-57 SDFN-58 SDFN-59</p> <p>TC-03</p>	<p>4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge</p> <p>6.1.11 Human environment</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>2.3.1.4 Water Development and Control</p> <p>9.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Surface Water</p> <p>9.1.6 Significance Definition</p> <p>9.4.1.4 Project Residual Effects</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS present baseline information to enable the identification of how the Project could affect the human environment, including the current use of all waterways. A description and analysis of the how Project-caused changes to the environment will affect Indigenous activities in the Project area, including the use of navigable waters is required.</p> <p>The EIS indicates a number of instances in which mean annual flows and mean monthly flows in waterbodies (Gordon Lake, Farley Lake, Farley Lake Outlet, Swede Lake Outlet, Keewatin River Tributary, etc.) are predicted to be affected by the Project, during all Project phases.</p> <p>The predicted effects to flows are not described in the EIS in relation to potential impacts to Indigenous rights, such as changes to preferred use conditions for navigation. For example, it is unclear if the current diversion channel is used for navigation/access purposes. Potential effects to downstream waterbodies need to be included in the assessment of impacts to Indigenous rights.</p> <p>Perceived effects related to water flow and quality can result in avoidance of waterbodies by Indigenous Groups, particularly if the perceived changes are linked to the Project and the changes are outside of natural variation.</p> <p>Changes in surface water quality and/or quantity can affect the ability or desire of Indigenous Groups to participate in traditional water-based activities as a result of the Project.</p>	<p>a. Identify and assess the pathways of effects between effects to surface water quality and quantity and potential impacts (tangible and intangible) to Indigenous Groups on current use of lands for traditional purposes and potential impacts the rights of Indigenous people.</p> <p>b. Describe dewatering of any natural waterways and identify potential effects to the current use of lands for traditional purposes and potential impacts to the rights of Indigenous people. Consider the response provided in Round 1 Package 1, IAAC-17.</p> <p>c. Identify if there was any navigability on the existing diversion channel and the initial creek. Describe if the diversion channel will be navigable after re-alignment.</p> <p>d. Describe measures to mitigate any effects identified in parts a and b.</p> <p>e. Describe monitoring and follow-up that will be implemented to validate the predictions of the assessment, confirm the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and respond to any unanticipated</p>

				<p>Impacts to surface water quality and quantity need to be examined in the context of impacts to Indigenous rights and to current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>This information is required to understand potential Project impacts to Indigenous Groups' access and practice of Indigenous rights.</p>	<p>effects identified during monitoring.</p> <p>f. Describe how information from Indigenous Groups on use and rights related to surface water quantity and quality were considered in the effects assessment for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. If this information was not considered, update the effects assessment to include information on Indigenous Groups' use and rights related to surface water quantity and quality.</p>
IAAC-192	<p>CCN-54 CCN-56 CCN-57 CCN-58 CCN-59 CCN-62</p> <p>MCCN-45</p> <p>SDFN-62 SDFN-64 SDFN-65 SDFN-66 SDFN-67</p>	<p>3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>10.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Fish and Fish Habitat</p> <p>10.1.2.4 Influence of Local or Regional Management Objectives</p> <p>10.1.4.1 Spatial Boundaries</p> <p>Table 10-1</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that spatial boundaries will be defined taking into account the appropriate scale and spatial extent of potential environmental effects; community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge; and current or TLRU by Indigenous Groups, including ecological, technical, social, and cultural considerations.</p> <p>The EIS states that "Manitoba Fisheries Branch's mandate is to "ensure sustainable use of the fisheries resource" (MSD 2019). Goals under this mandate include ensuring "No Net Loss" of fish habitat quality or quantity and ensuring that an adequate supply of fish exists for Indigenous peoples to fish for food (MSD 2017)." These goals "have been considered during this assessment and in the development of options for the offsetting plan required to counterbalance the unavoidable loss of fish habitat due to construction, operation, and closure of the Project."</p> <p>The LAA includes components of the Cockeram Lake and Ellystan Lake watersheds in which the proponent has determined that potential and measurable effects to fish and fish habitat may occur. It is unclear what criteria were used in this evaluation, and whether the selected components are adequate to represent potential Project effects to fish and fish habitat from the perspective of Indigenous Groups, based on current or TLRU.</p> <p>Perspectives on the spatial scale of potential Project effects to fish and fish habitat may differ. For example, downstream fishing sites (such as Sickle Lake) may be of high value or concern and it is unclear why they have been excluded from this evaluation. Similarly, it is unclear if the selected waterbodies are sufficient to capture Indigenous Groups' concerns about the effect of fishing pressure associated with an increase in the population in the Lynn Lake area. Social and cultural considerations need to be considered in the development of appropriate spatial boundaries.</p>	<p>a. Identify and assess the pathways of effects between effects to fish and fish habitat and potential effects (tangible and intangible) to Indigenous Groups on traditional practices and potential impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p> <p>b. Describe the baseline information used to determine an adequate supply of fish for Indigenous peoples for subsistence purposes.</p> <p>c. Clarify which rivers and lakes are known for fishing in the LAA and identify how they were considered in the effects assessment. Describe criteria used to determine which rivers and lakes were included in the LAA. Provide a rationale for the exclusion of rivers and lakes used for fishing within the watershed (e.g., Sickle Lake) in the LAA.</p> <p>d. Describe the impacts of increased fishing pressure throughout the LAAs and RAA, as a result of increased population in the Lynn Lake area, on the rights of Indigenous people.</p> <p>e. Assess the loss of fish species within the LAA and RAA that support the exercise of the rights of Indigenous people.</p>

				<p>This information is required to understand Project effects to fisheries and how these effects may impact Indigenous people and their rights.</p>	<p>f. Identify Project effects and mitigation measures that could affect the exercise of Indigenous fishing rights in the RAA.</p> <p>g. Describe how information from Indigenous Groups on use and impact to rights related to fish and fish habitat was considered in the effects assessment for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. If this information was not considered, update the effects assessment to include information on Indigenous Groups' use and rights related to fish and fish habitat.</p>
IAAC-193	<p>CCN-64 CCN-65 CCN-66</p> <p>SDFN-72 SDFN-73 SDFN-74</p>	<p>6.1.9 Indigenous peoples</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>10.4.2.4 Residual Effects</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS describe changes to the environment caused by the Project that will affect the health of Indigenous peoples, including changes to water quality and availability of country foods. The EIS Guidelines also require information related to the potential adverse impacts of the Project on the potential or established Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p> <p>The EIS predicts periodic surface water threshold exceedances of arsenic, cadmium, and copper during the post closure phase of the Project. Information to describe how these exceedances could affect Indigenous Groups' perception of the safe consumption of fish from these waters is missing. The perception of contaminated fish could lead to avoidance behaviors affecting the availability of the resource and affecting Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p> <p>This information is required to understand potential impacts of these exceedances on Indigenous Groups future land use patterns and the practice of their rights, including the perceived contamination of water and its potential effect on fish and fish habitat.</p>	<p>a. Describe how subsistence consumption/harvesting of fish will be affected based on the increases in dissolved chemical concentrations in the water and the perceived effects on fish.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Explain how this may affect the exercise of the rights of Indigenous people. ii. Update the effects assessment with this information and identify any mitigation measures, as required.
IAAC-194	<p>CCN-77</p> <p>MCCN-51</p> <p>SDFN-85</p>	<p>4.3 Study strategy and methodology</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>11.1.2.1 Indigenous Engagement</p> <p>11.1.4.1 Spatial Boundaries</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the proponent consider the potential adverse impacts that may result from the residual and cumulative environmental effects and include the perspectives of potentially affected Indigenous Groups where these were provided to the proponent.</p> <p>The EIS states that traditional resources such as vegetation and wetland were identified in engagement with Indigenous Groups and are common throughout the RAA. This rationale, traditional resources in the RAA, does</p>	<p>a. Identify and assess the pathways of effects between effects to vegetation and wetlands and the potential impacts (tangible and intangible) to Indigenous Groups on use of lands for traditional purposes and potential impacts to the rights of Indigenous people.</p>

			11.4.6 Project Residual Effects	<p>not discuss the importance of certain locales where harvesting or other Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982 activities pertaining to vegetation occur. For example, a particular locale where a plant species is found may hold more significance due to its role in an Indigenous Group's history or knowledge sharing and may be in a locale of preferred use in the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982.</p> <p>The amount of wetland and the duration of wetland loss will have subsequent impacts on the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982, as restoration of wetlands can take upwards of 50 years to occur. This timeline will constitute a significant interruption in the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982.</p> <p>Additional information is required to understand how Project effects to vegetation and specific wetlands could impact Indigenous people and their ability to practice their rights.</p>	<p>b. Describe how information from Indigenous Groups on use and impact to rights related to surface vegetation and wetlands was considered in the effects assessment for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. If this information was not considered, update the effects assessment to include information on Indigenous Groups' use and rights related to surface vegetation and wetlands.</p>
IAAC-195	CCN-81 CCN-82 CCN-84 SDFN-89 SDFN-90 SDFN-92	2.4 Application of the precautionary approach 4.3 Study strategy and methodology 6.1.9 Indigenous peoples 6.2 Predicted changes to the physical environment 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples 6.5 Significance of residual effects	12.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat 12.1.3 Potential Effects, Pathways and Measurable Parameters 12.1.5 Residual Effects Characterization Tables 12-2 and 12-3 17.1.4 Potential Effects, Pathways and Measurable Parameters	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the EIS include an analysis of the pathway of the effects of environmental changes to each VC. The EIS will document where and how scientific, engineering, community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge were used to reach conclusions. The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to identify species of importance, including assessing the quality and quantity of preferred traditional resources and locations via ambient/sensory environment (e.g., noise, air quality, and visual landscape) and identify all sensory and observable change indicators adopted as a result of traditional knowledge in relation to each VC. The EIS Guidelines also require that the EIS indicate the significance of residual effects after having established the technically and economically feasible mitigation measures and require that the environmental effects assessment will use best available information and methods as well as the precautionary approach.</p> <p>EIS Table 12-2 summarizes the effects and effects pathways for wildlife and wildlife habitat. The effects pathways are identified for Change in Habitat, Change in Mortality Risk, and Change in Wildlife Health. Change in Habitat is defined as "Direct and/or indirect loss or alteration of habitat due to vegetation clearing, sensory disturbance (e.g., avoidance), and/or edge effects."</p> <p>The EIS needs to identify any changes that could detract from use or lead to avoidance of the area as a result of real and perceived disturbance of the</p>	<p>a. Identify and assess the pathways of effects between effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat and potential impacts (tangible and intangible) to Indigenous Groups on use of lands for traditional purposes and potential impacts to right of Indigenous people.</p> <p>b. Describe how the pathways of effects outlined in part a were considered in the qualitative assessment of magnitude of effects and the characterization of residual effects. If these pathways were not considered in the effects assessment, provide an updated effects assessment on Indigenous Groups' use of lands for traditional purposes and potential impacts to Indigenous people and their rights.</p> <p>c. Describe how information from Indigenous Groups on use and impact to rights related to wildlife and wildlife habitat was considered in the development of the significance criteria for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. If this information was not considered, update the assessment to include information on Indigenous</p>

			Tables 17-1 and 17-2	<p>environment (e.g., observation of and fear of contamination of water or country foods).</p> <p>Avoidance is calculated for wildlife in relation to Change in Habitat. However, sensory disturbance and its impact on avoidance is not calculated for the wildlife species of importance to Indigenous Groups and how this may impact their rights. Sensory disturbance is not considered as a pathway of effects for changes to habitat.</p> <p>The effect pathway of Change in Wildlife Health does not include a direct consideration for “Loss of wildlife species that support the exercise of Indigenous rights”, or more broadly changes to wildlife species that support those rights. Effects to species of importance are not considered as a pathways of effects for changes to wildlife health.</p> <p>Effects pathways for the Project need to include sensory disturbance and effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups and the impact these effects would have on Indigenous Groups and their rights. This information is required to understand the indirect impacts to Indigenous Groups from Project effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p>	Groups’ use and rights related to wildlife and wildlife habitat.
IAAC-196	CCN-39 CCN-42 CCN-43 MCCN-19 SDFN-46 SDFN-48 SDFN-50 SDFN-151	5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised 6.4 Mitigation measures 6.1.9 Indigenous peoples 6.3.2 Migratory Birds 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples	7.1.2.1 Indigenous Engagement 7.4.1.3 Mitigation 7.4.2.3 Mitigation 7.4.2.4 Project Residual Effects 7.9 Follow-up and Monitoring 19.10 Follow-up and Monitoring 23.5.8 Noise Monitoring Plan	<p>The EIS Guidelines note that the EIS must describe changes to the environment caused by the Project that will affect the health of Indigenous peoples, including changes to noise exposure, effects of vibration from blasting, and current and future availability of country foods. The EIS Guidelines require information related to the potential adverse impacts of the Project on the potential or established Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>, including title and related interests, and proposed mitigation or accommodation measures for these impacts.</p> <p>The noise assessment considered stationary equipment (pumps, motors, and crushers), mobile equipment (back up alarms), and pile driving. Blasting was only considered in relation to vibration. The assessment determined that Project noise is within guidance targets.</p> <p>The effects of noise/vibration on wildlife and migratory bird distribution have not been considered in relation to impacts on Indigenous Groups under subsection 5(1)(c) of CEEA, in particular with respect to preferred harvesting locations and timing for current use.</p>	a. Describe how noise/vibration effects, including blasting, may induce avoidance behavior by wildlife and migratory birds and how that may impact Indigenous land users exercising their Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> . Update the effects assessment with this information and identify any mitigation measures as required.

				Additional information is required on how effects to wildlife from noise and vibrations from blasting will impact Indigenous people and their ability to exercise their Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> .	
IAAC-197	MCCN-05	<p>3.1 Project components</p> <p>3.2 Project activities</p> <p>5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>2.3.2.2 Other Waste Storage and Management</p> <p>2.3.2.3 Utilities and Infrastructure</p> <p>12.4.2.2 Project Pathways</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the EIS to identify permanent and temporary linear infrastructures (road, railroad, pipelines, power supply), including the route of each, the location, structures to be used for stream crossings, descriptions of the activities to be carried out during each phase, the location of each activity, expected material inputs and outputs, and an indication of the activity's magnitude and scale. The EIS Guidelines require a description of changes to access in areas used for traditional purposes as a result of the Project. The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of changes to the environment that affect the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, including how these changes may affect conditions that support traditional use and practices, such as cultural value and practices in the area, experience and connection to the land, and real and perceived quality and availability of resources. The EIS Guidelines state that the assessment of Project effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(c) of CEEA 2012, obtain and incorporate views from each Indigenous Group that may be affected by the Project.</p> <p>EIS Chapter 2 states that the proponent will “provide the new 138 kV substation and 34.5 kV distribution line to the MacLellan site from Lynn Lake”. The EIS noted that alignment, rights-of-way, and location of the distribution line and substation have not been determined and that associated infrastructure elements are in preliminary planning stages.</p> <p>EIS Chapter 12 suggests that “clearing for the power distribution line right-of-way segment from PR 391 to the site will involve approximately 10 ha of land. An additional 3.2 km segment from a new station built by Alamos near Lynn Lake to PR 391 at the entrance to the site is required. The power distribution line may require new access road(s) of 0.5 km (approx.) in length to be built for access to the distribution line”. The EIS states that “The [power] line is anticipated to require two watercourse crossings.”</p> <p>The EIS also notes that the construction of a new single-lane steel bridge crossing of the Keewatin will be required and that the potential need for upgrades to PR 391 and weight exception requirements to support the Project are being discussed with Manitoba Infrastructure. There is no</p>	<p>a. Describe how engagement, including the collection and identification of issues, with Indigenous Groups will be undertaken for all permanent and temporary Project infrastructure including the transmission line rights of way, bridge construction, and road upgrades.</p> <p>b. Incorporate the outcome of the engagement activities into the assessment and update the related effects assessments for the Project. Identify any changes to the conclusions of the effects assessments and any additional mitigation measures, as necessary.</p>

				<p>description of the potential road upgrade construction activities in the EIS. These details were requested in Round 1 Package 1 IAAC-08, IAAC-09, and IAAC-10.</p> <p>Additional information is needed to understand Project permanent and temporary infrastructure (such as power distribution line, bridge crossings, etc.) for preliminary routes, the configuration of infrastructure (above ground, below ground, overhead, underground), and the preliminary considerations of environmental constraints (such as watercourses and wetlands; known areas of habitat for rare species; archeological resources). The locations and sizes of these respective components and related effects to biophysical VCs and impacts to Indigenous Groups and their ability to practice their Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> (i.e., access to Crown lands, actual and perceived changes to resources, etc.) are not discussed in the EIS.</p> <p>This information is required to understand the potential impacts of new infrastructure on the Indigenous Groups' current land use activities and to their ability practice their Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p>	
IAAC-198	MMF-27 MMF-28 MMF-30	4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge	EIS Summary	<p>The EIS Guidelines require that the assessment of Project effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(c) of CEAA 2012. The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to engage Indigenous Groups and obtain and incorporate views in the EIS.</p> <p>The EIS notes that MMF use the RAA and sites and features within 100 km of the Project. No reference is made to MMF use and occupancy within the LAA and PDA. Additional information is required to assess the extent of the Project's impact to Métis rights.</p> <p>The Manitoba Metis Traditional Knowledge, Land Use and Occupancy (MMTKLUO) Study for the Project found current uses of land for traditional purposes, occupancy sites, and country food harvesting close to and within the PDA. Although, the MMTKLUO Study is completed, a data sharing and use agreement is not finalized to provide additional detail and localized information.</p> <p>Information is needed to identify potential community specific Project issues and potential impacts to Indigenous peoples and their rights.</p>	<p>a. Provide detailed and localized information on MMF's use and occupancy values in the PDA and LAA. If this information cannot be obtained, provide a rationale.</p> <p>b. Provide an updated effects assessment, using all information available, to determine Manitoba Métis-specific potential effects, direct and indirect pathways of effects, effects assessment, mitigation measures, and significance of residual effects. Validate the assessment with the MMF.</p>

IAAC-199	CCN-20 CCN-21 CCN-68 CCN-73 CCN-93 CCN-95 CCN-96 CCN-98 CCN-99 CCN-100 CCN-102 CCN-103	2.4 Application of the precautionary approach 3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries 4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge	2.2.2 In-Design Mitigation 2.2.3 Environmental Protection, Mitigation and Management 4.1 Introduction 8.1.6 Significance Definition	The EIS Guidelines require the assessment of Project effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, pursuant to paragraph 5(1)(c) of CEEA 2012. The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to engage Indigenous Groups and obtain and incorporate views in the EIS. The EIS notes that residual effects are “amalgamated in summary because the effects pathways and Project effects identified for each potentially affected community were similar and lead to similar conclusions.” Not all Indigenous Groups had the opportunity to provide their views and concerns about the Project to the proponent, including views on: community specific traditional ecological knowledge; current use information within respective traditional territory; and mitigation measures, including measures to avoid or minimize Project effects to sensitive areas (such as watercourses, wetlands, important habitat types, areas of high archaeological potential, and areas of importance identified by Indigenous Groups) and on species of preferred use.	<p>a. Update the effects assessment for current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes for each Indigenous Group based on additional engagement, supplementary information and new TLRU studies received. Update the significance criteria, characterization of residual effects, and significance conclusions based on the new information.</p> <p>b. Identify and describe how information from each Indigenous Group was and will be integrated into the assessment, including significance criteria, and updates on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>c. Identify and describe any disparity between the views of Indigenous Groups and the proponent on the consideration of Indigenous knowledge (methodology used and the outcomes of the analysis), efforts made to reconcile the disparities, and rationale for conclusions on matters for which disparity in views remains.</p>
	IAAC MCCN-51 MCCN-58 MCCN-68 MCCN-71 MCCN-72 MCCN-73 MCCN-74 MCCN-75 MCCN-76 MCCN-77 MCCN-78 MCCN-79 MCCN-90 MCCN-91 MCCN-92 MCCN-94	5.0 Engagement With Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised 6.1.9 Indigenous peoples 6.3.4 Indigenous peoples 6.5 Significance of residual effects	11.1.4.1 Spatial Boundaries 11.4.4.3 Project Residual Effect 12.1.4.1 Spatial Boundaries 17.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes by Indigenous Peoples	EIS Chapter 19 notes that the information used in the EIS is current to May 22, 2020. The Proponent indicates it will continue to engage with the Indigenous Groups to collect, review, consider, and summarize new Indigenous and community knowledge that pertains to traditional knowledge, TLRU, the location of sites or areas of importance, knowledge relevant to other sections of the EIS and proposed mitigation measures. This additional information is required to better identify and understand Project effects, appropriate mitigation measures, and potential impacts to current use and the rights of Indigenous people.	
	MMF-01 SDFN-21 SDFN-22 SDFN-76 SDFN-81 SDFN-94 SDFN-106 SDFN-108 SDFN-109	12.2.1.1 Background review	19.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Indigenous Peoples		

	SDFN-111 SDFN-112 SDFN-113 SDFN-115 SDFN-116 SDFN-117 SDFN-118 SDFN-145 SDFN-146 SDFN-148				
Mitigation and Monitoring of Potential Impacts to Indigenous Peoples					
IAAC-200	CCN-04 CCN-06 CCN-22 CCN-52 CCN-60 CCN-69 CCN-70 CCN-71 CCN-72 CCN-74 CCN-92 CCN-115 CCN-118 CCN-121 CCN-125 CCN-126 CCN-127 CCN-128 CCN-129 CCN-130 CCN-131 IAAC MCCN-99 MCCN-100 MCCN-101 MCCN-102 MCCN-103	5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised 6.1.11 Human environment 6.6.3 Cumulative effects assessment 8.0 Follow-up and Monitoring Programs	1.4.1.1 Federal Requirements Table 1-2 2.2.3 Environmental Protection, Mitigation and Management 3.3 Engagement with Indigenous Communities 4.3.7 Environmental Management Plans and Monitoring 9.4.2.1 Analytical Assessment Methods 11.4.2.2 Mitigation	The EIS Guidelines require that a follow-up program is designed to verify the accuracy of the effects assessment and to determine the effectiveness of the measures implemented to mitigate the adverse effects of the Project. Where there is uncertainty about effects outcomes, the proponent will show evidence of detailed follow-up and monitoring programs to identify change, and identify adaptive management measures that will be applied. EIS Sections 19.8 and 3.37 note that mitigation-specific feedback has not yet been received from Indigenous Groups and that feedback will be managed going forward as monitoring results are presented to government and Indigenous Groups. The EIS notes that follow-up and monitoring requirements specific to Indigenous peoples have not yet been identified, but that the development of follow-up and monitoring measures for Indigenous peoples will be based on sharing other relevant monitoring results with Indigenous communities as part of the proponent's ongoing engagement process for the Project. Additional information is required to understand the proponent's commitment to ongoing engagement with potentially affected Indigenous Groups to discuss the efficacy of mitigation measures and monitoring programs. EIS Section 23.5 states "Incidents such as accidents and malfunctions (i.e., spills, fires, explosions, collisions) and environmental damage will be reported immediately to the construction supervisor and applicable regulatory authority." The EIS also states that "summary reports from follow-up programs will be submitted on a regular basis to regulatory authorities, as required."	a. Describe how Indigenous Groups will be involved in the development and implementation of mitigation measures, and follow-up and monitoring programs for the following VCs: i. cultural heritage resources and sites of significance; ii. current use of resources for traditional purposes; and iii. Indigenous peoples' health and socio-economic conditions. b. Explain how the proponent will share monitoring results with Indigenous Groups and how feedback will be managed. c. Provide an outline of and rationale for the complaint/grievance mechanism(s) that will be developed for this Project. d. Describe the protocol for notifying Indigenous Groups of accidents and malfunctions during all phases of the Project. e. Identify how proposed mitigation measures address each Indigenous Group's specific concerns about the Project. Document and incorporate community specific feedback on this evaluation from potentially affected Indigenous Groups.

	MCCN-104 MCCN-105 SDFN-04 SDFN-06 SDFN-23 SDFN-68 SDFN-77 SDFN-78 SDFN-79 SDFN-80 SDFN-82 SDFN-105 SDFN-131 SDFN-134 SDFN-137 SDFN-141 SDFN-143 SDFN-144 SDFN-151 SDFN-152		16.4.2.2 Mitigation 17.7 Determination of Significance 19.0 Assessment of Potential Effects to Indigenous Peoples 23.5 Environmental Monitoring and Management Plans 23.5.11 Heritage and Cultural Resources Protection Plan	Additional information is required to understand how community complaints will be registered, tracked, and addressed, including grievance management approaches. Additional information is required to understand the Indigenous Groups' participation and contributions in the development of mitigation measures and monitoring programs.	f. Identify and describe any disparity between the views and conclusions of Indigenous Groups and the proponent regarding the Project's mitigation and monitoring measures, efforts made to reconcile the disparities, and rationale for conclusions on matters for which any disparity in views remains.
--	---	--	--	--	---

Aboriginal and Treaty Rights

IAAC-201	CCN-05 CCN-06 CCN-18 MCCN-10 MCCN-11 MCCN-12 SDFN-05 SDFN-06	2.3 Engagement with Indigenous groups 5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised	3.3.4 Indigenous Engagement Methods	The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to engage with Indigenous Groups as early as possible in the Project planning process. The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to describe Indigenous Groups' contribution to the effects assessment methodology, including selection of VCs and spatial and temporal boundaries. The EIS Guidelines require the proponent to provide Indigenous Groups with key EA documents, including baseline studies, EIS, key findings, and plain language summaries. The EIS does not identify how the proponent engaged with each Indigenous Group on the Project design, including opportunities provided to Indigenous Groups to contribute to the effects assessment methodology. Additional information is required to understand how Indigenous Groups views were incorporated into the early stages of the planning process which will be informed by information on the Proponent's engagement activities.	a. Describe efforts to engage Indigenous Groups regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Project design and plans for ongoing engagement in the Project planning process; ii. the effects assessment methodology, including for cumulative effects and VCs of interest to each Indigenous Group; iii. opportunities to verify the proponent's interpretation of the Indigenous Group's views on Project design; and iv. the provision of key EA documents, baseline studies, EIS, key findings, and plain language summaries.
----------	---	---	---	---	---

					<p>b. Describe each Indigenous Groups' views and how their views were incorporated into Project planning, design, assessment of effects and impacts, and selection of mitigation or accommodation measures, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indigenous and community knowledge; ii. current use within an Indigenous Group's respective traditional territory; iii. proposed mitigation measures; and iv. concerns about the Project's potential environmental effects and impacts to Aboriginal and Treaty rights.
IAAC-202	<p>CCN-03 CCN-07 CCN-10 CCN-12 CCN-13 CCN-15 CCN-17 CCN-24 CCN-55 CCN-67 CCN-86 CCN-104 CCN-105 CCN-106 CCN-107 CCN-113 CCN-119 CCN-122 CCN-124</p> <p>IAAC</p> <p>MCCN-12 MCCN-13 MCCN-14 MCCN-16 MCCN-93</p>	<p>3.2.3 Spatial and temporal boundaries</p> <p>4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge</p> <p>5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised</p> <p>6.6.3 Cumulative effects Assessment</p>	<p>2.2.3 Environmental Protection, Mitigation and Management</p> <p>3.3.2 Identification of Potentially Interested Indigenous Communities</p> <p>3.3.4 Indigenous Engagement Methods</p> <p>3.3.5 Indigenous Engagement Results</p> <p>4.1 Introduction</p> <p>10.1.2.1 Indigenous and Public Engagement</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require information related to the potential adverse impacts of the Project on the potential or established Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982, including title and related interests, and proposed mitigation or accommodation measures for these impacts. The mitigation measures are to be written as specific commitments that clearly describe how the proponent intends to implement them, and may go beyond mitigation measures that address potential adverse environmental effects. The EIS Guidelines require documented views of Indigenous Groups about the Project impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and that groups are provided with opportunities to validate the interpretation of their views. The proponent will keep records of its engagement activities, interactions with Indigenous Groups, the issues raised by each group, and how the proponent addressed the concerns raised. The proponent will share these records with the Agency.</p> <p>According to the methodology outlined in EIS Section 19.1.1.3, the assessment and conclusion of potential impacts to rights are not separated by Indigenous Group, are based on an amalgamation of biophysical data, and data provided by some Indigenous Groups. An assessment of impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982, must be undertaken for each Indigenous Group.</p> <p>Section 19.9 of the EIS states: "Alamos recognizes that Indigenous communities are in the best position to identify potential Project effects on the ability to exercise their Indigenous or Treaty rights, and feedback received from Indigenous communities on potential Project effects to rights will be provided to the IAAC in a supplemental filing of the EIS."</p>	<p>a. Describe efforts to engage Indigenous Groups, gather views, and validate information regarding the methodology in assessing potential impacts of the Project on Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982, including views on the selection of VCs and spatial and temporal boundaries. Provide engagement records.</p> <p>b. Identify the following from the perspective of each Indigenous Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. VCs related to the Indigenous Group's Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982, including potential or established rights, title, and related interests, that may be impacted by the Project; ii. the conditions that are needed to support each VC for the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982, and how past, current, and reasonably foreseeable activities affect or will affect these conditions; iii. the general (or specific) geographic area where the Indigenous Group exercises Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>, 1982; and iv. how the Project affects each VC identified, related to the Indigenous Groups' exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act</i>

	MMF-01 SDFN-03 SDFN-07 SDFN-10 SDFN-11 SDFN-12 SDFN-13 SDFN-14 SDFN-15 SDFN-16 SDFN-18 SDFN-19 SDFN-26 SDFN-63 SDFN-75 SDFN-119 SDFN-120 SDFN-121 SDFN-122 SDFN-123 SDFN-135 SDFN-138 SDFN-140 SDFN-142 SDFN-149 SDFN-150		11.1.2.1 Indigenous Engagement 19.0 Assessment of Potential Effects to Indigenous Peoples 19.1.1.3 Methodology 19.9 Indigenous or Treaty Rights 23.0 Environmental Management and Monitoring	Additional information is required to inform the assessment and understand the potential impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> . The provision of impact pathways and alignment of pathways with VCs that support the exercise of rights, will inform the assessment of potential impacts to rights. This assessment may include rights not expressed through harvesting rights. Available TLRU studies are not a proxy to understanding impacts to other Indigenous Groups. The EIS references the proponent's commitment to ongoing engagement with Indigenous Groups and to considering any additional information about Project impacts to Indigenous or Treaty rights brought forward by Indigenous Groups. Additional information is required to understand potential impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> , on each Indigenous Group.	<i>Act, 1982</i> . c. Define the criteria identified or validated by each Indigenous Group for assessing the severity of potential Project impacts (positive and negative) on the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> . Criteria could consider: i. the nature of rights ii. regional/historic/cumulative impacts iii. cultural landscape iv. preferred expression of rights d. Provide an analysis on the severity of potential impacts on each VC identified in the EIS and the potential exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> , for each Indigenous Group. Describe impacts that have not been fully mitigated or accommodated as part of the EA. Provide engagement records with Indigenous Groups related to this topic. e. Identify and describe disparity between the views and conclusions of Indigenous Groups and the proponent regarding the severity of the Project's potential impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> , efforts made to reconcile the disparities, and rationale for conclusions on matters for which disparity in views remains. f. Describe mitigation measures that specifically address potential impacts to the Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> , to each Indigenous Group. Include any commitments that would seek to avoid, mitigate or reduce potential impacts to the rights of Indigenous peoples.
IAAC-203	SDFN-95 SDFN-96	1.4 Regulatory framework and the role of government	3.0 Engagement 12.2.2.2 Species at Risk and Species of	The EIS Guidelines require the identification of any treaty, self-government or other agreements between federal or provincial governments and Indigenous Groups pertinent to the EA. The EIS Guidelines require information related to the potential adverse impacts of the Project on the potential or established Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> ,	a. Identify any treaty, self-government or other agreements between federal or provincial governments and Indigenous Groups pertinent to the EA.

		<p>5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised</p> <p>6.1.9 Indigenous peoples</p> <p>6.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments</p> <p>6.3.4 Indigenous peoples</p>	<p>Conservation Concern</p> <p>17.0 Assessment of Potential Effects on Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes by Indigenous Peoples</p>	<p>including title and related interests, and proposed mitigation or accommodation measures for these impacts.</p> <p>EIS Section 12.2.2.2 notes that caribou in general, have been identified as an important resource for Indigenous Groups and that numerous concerns were raised about the Project’s potential effects to caribou populations, by Indigenous Groups and other stakeholders. However, no recent traditional ecological knowledge observations or accounts of rights-based hunting activity for Woodland Caribou in the RAA are included. The EIS notes the observation of several individual caribou in the RAA west of Lynn Lake in April 2019, which indicates Woodland Caribou may occasionally occur in the RAA.</p> <p>The EIS lacks information on the cultural importance of Woodland Caribou as subsistence species for Indigenous Groups, and on the baseline conditions and historic impacts on caribou in the RAA.</p> <p>Rights-based hunting is only one activity associated with caribou. The governance rights to traditionally manage Woodland Caribou based on traditional practices could also be impacted by Project activities. The EIS does not consider governance-based rights and how they may be affected by Project impacts to the species.</p> <p>Additional information on historical and holistic importance of caribou to Indigenous Groups and information on any treaty, self-government or other agreements between federal or provincial governments and Indigenous Groups pertinent to the EA, is needed to understand the Project’s potential impact to the cultural environment and to the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>.</p>	<p>b. Describe the cultural and traditional management importance of Woodland Caribou to Indigenous Groups. Consider and cite proponent engagement activities and TLRU studies.</p> <p>c. Describe the baseline conditions and historic impacts on caribou and the governance of caribou in the RAA, citing information sources, including proponent engagement activities and TLRU studies.</p> <p>d. Define criteria identified by Indigenous Groups and use the criteria to assess the severity of impacts of the Project (positive and negative) on their governance-based right to traditionally manage Woodland Caribou.</p> <p>e. Identify and describe disparity between the views of Indigenous Groups and the proponent on the severity of potential impacts to governance-based rights. Identify efforts made to reconcile the disparities and rationale for conclusions on matters for which a disparity in views remains.</p>
IAAC-204	IAAC	<p>4.2.2 Community knowledge and Aboriginal traditional knowledge</p> <p>5.0 Engagement with Indigenous Groups and Concerns Raised</p>	<p>3.3.1 Objective and Approach to Engagement with Indigenous Communities</p> <p>3.3.7 Ongoing Engagement with Indigenous Communities</p>	<p>The EIS Guidelines require documented views of Indigenous Groups about the Project’s impact to their Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> and proposed mitigation measures. It also requires that Indigenous Groups are provided with opportunities to validate the interpretation of their views. The proponent will keep detailed tracking records of its engagement activities, recording all interactions with Indigenous Groups, the issues raised by each group, and how the proponent addressed the concerns raised. The proponent will share these records with the Agency.</p> <p>The EIS notes that the proponent will provide feedback to Indigenous Groups and “demonstrate how input influenced the decisions made and</p>	<p>a. For IAAC-188, IAAC-189, IAAC-191, IAAC-192, IAAC-194, IAAC-195, IAAC-197, IAAC-199, IAAC-200, IAAC-202 and IAAC-203, describe the plan to engage with each of the Indigenous Groups to verify the assessment of potential impacts to Section 35 Rights of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>, the significance determination thresholds, analysis methods, and Indigenous specific mitigation measures and monitoring. If required, update the assessment with new information and identify new mitigation measures.</p>

			<p>19.1.1.4 The Influence of Engagement on the Assessment</p> <p>19.10 Follow-Up and Monitoring</p>	<p>mitigation measures developed.” It is not clear whether information provided in the EIS (impacts to rights and effects of the Project on the environment, and related analysis, conclusions, mitigation measures and monitoring) have been discussed with or verified by Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>The EIS does not describe next steps in the engagement process and how impacts to rights or analysis taken of Project effects on biophysical components of the environment (that could impact rights) were verified or will be verified with Indigenous Groups. Information on whether proposed mitigation measures and monitoring are adequate in addressing any outstanding impacts or conformation that proposed mitigation measures will not cause additional impacts is missing.</p> <p>Information on engagement to verify information used in the EIS (related to the analysis, conclusions, mitigation measures, and monitoring) is required to understand whether the conclusions presented in the EIS is accurate representation of potential impacts to rights and effects on the environment.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--