

Mathias Colomb Cree Nation – Review of Alamos’ Aug 4, 2021 Responses to IAAC’s January 22, 2021 Technical Review Information Requests Round 1, Package 3

--

September 13, 2021

Reference	IAAC Information Request	MCCN Evaluation of Response Adequacy	Additional MCCN Request
IAAC-146 MCCN-51	<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>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>	<p>Partially adequate.</p> <p>The Proponent has clarified that the LAA includes a 100 m buffer around the furthest groundwater drawdown contours. The Proponent maintains that the LAA represents the maximum area within which Project environmental effects can be predicted or measured with a reasonable degree of accuracy and confidence.</p> <p>The Proponent notes that Project-specific Traditional Land and Resource Use (TLRU) studies completed by Indigenous Nations included boundaries that differ from the environmental assessment. The Proponent has noted that information regarding traditional use sites, activities, and resources beyond the spatial boundaries of the EIS are considered.</p> <p>MCCN provided the Proponent with its TLRUS Study on June 3, 2021. The Proponent’s response to IAAC-146 does not indicate how the spatial boundaries account for potential interactions with values and resources identified in MCCN’s TLRUS Report.</p>	<p>Clarify how traditional use sites, activities, and resources related to vegetation and wetlands, as identified in MCCN’s TLRUS Report, are adequately captured by the spatial boundaries identified in the EIS.</p>
IAAC-147 MCCN-52	<p>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</p>	<p>Partially adequate.</p> <p>The Proponent has provided the requested information. However, MCCN finds the direct and indirect effects to wetlands summarized in the Proponent’s response deeply concerning.</p>	<p>Please describe how direct and indirect Project effects to wetlands will be offset to align with provincial and federal principals of no net loss.</p> <p>Offsetting measures must include consideration of equivalency, uncertainty, and time lags. Please clearly identify how Project</p>

	<p>RAA during Project construction, operation, decommissioning and closure phases.</p> <p>b. Clarify the definition of indirect losses and the difference from direct losses for vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Gordon site is expected to directly affect 64.8 ha of wetland (which will not be reclaimed) and may indirectly result in the loss of and additional 660.3 ha of wetland. The combined direct and indirect effects represent a potential 100% loss of fen, swamp, and marsh habitat within the PDA and LAA.</p> <p>Similarly, the MacLellan site is expected to directly affect 336.2 ha of wetland and may indirectly result in the loss of an additional 603.3 ha of wetland, representing 100% of the fen, swamp, and marsh within the site PDA and LAA.</p> <p>The lack of offsetting for these impacts is inconsistent with the Manitoba government's "no net loss" approach to wetlands (<i>Sustainable Waters Act</i>, June 2018), and the Federal Wetland Policy (1991).</p>	<p>effects to wetland habitat and anticipated benefits of the offset measures compare in terms of kind, proximity, condition, and quantity (i.e., area).</p>
<p>IAAC-152 MCCN-54</p>	<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.</p> <p>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 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</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>Tables IAAC-147-1 and 147-2 (see IAAC-147 response) present the total area and percent change in area of land cover classes associated with direct Project effects. While this table describes indirect effects to fen, marsh, and swamp wetlands in the LAA due to changes in surface water patterns and groundwater drawdown, other indirect effects to vegetation have not been quantified. It is unclear, for example, to what extent each vegetation class (and associated plant species of importance) may be indirectly affected by edge effects associated with clearing, dust deposition, and/or the introduction and spread of weeds.</p> <p>The Proponent notes in its response to IAAC-152 that commercially available native plant species of interest to Indigenous Nations will be included in reclamation seed mixes. This mitigation measure lacks clear targets and assurances that</p>	<p>Please provide a tabular summary of the total area for each vegetation class that may be indirectly affected by the Project (e.g., by edge effects, dust deposition, groundwater drawdown, and the introduction or spread of weeds).</p>

	<p>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>	<p>plant species of importance to Indigenous Nations will be adequately recovered following Project closure (see MCCN's evaluation of the Proponent's response to IAAC-155).</p>	
IAAC-155	<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 of any mitigation measures for plant species of importance (i.e., harvested species).</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The identified mitigation measures for plant species of importance to Indigenous groups are insufficient to address direct and indirect effects and uncertainties to this VC.</p> <p>The only reclamation measure for plant species of importance to Indigenous groups described in the Proponent's response is the inclusion of commercially available native plant species of interest in reclamation seed mixes. It is unclear what action will be taken, if any, to recover native plant species of interest for which commercial seed is not available. Furthermore, it is uncertain whether this mitigation measure will result in a return to a pre-impact abundance and community structure for plant species of importance.</p> <p>The Proponent's response does not describe plans for further engagement with Indigenous Groups in the development of mitigation measures for SOCCs or plant species of importance. While the Proponent has committed to engaging with affected Indigenous groups on ongoing environmental management and</p>	<p>Please provide a commitment to work with MCCN on a seed and live stake collection program to support the reclamation of plant species of importance to Indigenous groups.</p> <p>Please provide a clear commitment to engage with MCCN in a detailed review of the environmental management and monitoring plans, to ensure that the plans address MCCN concerns. Please describe how the Proponent will work with MCCN to provide the necessary time and resources to support meaningful participation in this process.</p> <p>MCCN requests that the Proponent identify a process (including sufficient funds for engagement and review) for incorporating Indigenous observations of impacts and concerns, as well as feedback on reports, into continued adaptive management and monitoring strategies for plant species of importance.</p> <p>For residual effects to plant species of importance, which cannot be adequately addressed by mitigation measures, please identify offset measures. Please identify how Project effects and</p>

		<p>monitoring plans, it remains unclear how this engagement will be conducted and whether sufficient time and resources will be provided for MCCN’s meaningful participation in the process.</p> <p>Until the details of these plans (including the locations of interventions, planned protocols, monitoring parameters, and adaptive management thresholds) have been developed, MCCN cannot comment on the adequacy of these measures.</p>	<p>anticipated benefits of the offset measures compare in terms of kind, proximity, condition, and quantity (i.e., area).</p>
IAAC-158	<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> <p>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.</p> <p>ii. Describe how indirect effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups were considered in the residual and cumulative effects assessments.</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent has not updated the cumulative effects assessment for vegetation and wetlands to consider the cumulative effects on current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. The Proponent has concluded that cumulative effects could not be quantified due to a lack of data on the extent of future projects and abundance of plants of interest to Indigenous Nations in the RAA. The EIS therefore remains incomplete and inconsistent with the requirements outlined in the EIS Guidelines.</p> <p>Plants of importance to Indigenous Nations were documented in all vegetation classes present within the PDA and LAA. It would therefore be conservative to operate under the assumption that plant species of importance to Indigenous Nations may also occur in these land cover classes throughout the RAA, and that any existing and future development with impacts to these land cover classes may have direct and indirect effects to this VC.</p> <p>As noted in MCCN’s evaluation of the Proponent’s response to IAAC-155, there are outstanding concerns regarding the efficacy of standard mitigation measures. This casts uncertainty on the ability of mitigation measures to reduce cumulative effects.</p>	<p>Please update the cumulative effects assessment for vegetation and wetlands to consider the cumulative effects on current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>Please include a quantification of potential cumulative effects (including direct and indirect effects) for past, current, and future projects.</p> <p>Consider the timeframes and potential impacts of post-closure phases for the sites spanning 10-50 years.</p> <p>Please identify how Indigenous perspectives and knowledge were applied in the development of thresholds for the cumulative effects assessment, including magnitude of effect.</p>

<p>IAAC-159 MCCN-102 MCCN-103</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> <p>i. Soil Management and Rehabilitation Plan</p> <p>ii. Vegetation and Weed Management Plan</p> <p>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> <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>	<p>Partially adequate.</p> <p>The Proponent has provided additional description of the plans requested by IAAC-159.</p> <p>Overall, the information provided to date is very general. The details of how mitigation and monitoring measures will be accomplished are very important and must be subject to careful review by Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>While the provided materials generally support best practices for mitigation and monitoring, it may not be sufficient to meet provincial requirements or requirements from the perspective of MCCN. Higher standards may be required for some of the plans.</p> <p>MCCN notes, for example, that the scope of the Vegetation and Weed Management Plan should include guiding restoration / reclamation of the site based on Indigenous knowledge. Meeting provincial guidelines for weed management may not be sufficient; use of spraying to control weeds may not be acceptable.</p> <p>These plans incorporate the use of triggers and thresholds for determining when actions are required. These triggers and thresholds have yet to be identified and it is unclear how traditional use and Indigenous knowledge will be considered in the evaluation of mitigation measure success. Similarly, the Proponent has not identified how Indigenous input will be utilized in creating adaptive management strategies, where mitigations are unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Identify a process (including sufficient funds for engagement and review) for incorporating community-based monitoring/guardianship, including observations of impacts and concerns, into continued monitoring and adaptive strategies.</p> <p>Base triggers and thresholds for management actions on traditional use and Indigenous knowledge, as well as scientific information where available. Management and monitoring plans should clearly identify how triggers and thresholds are determined.</p> <p>Develop the adaptive management framework for each plan utilizing Indigenous input. MCCN input can help identify thresholds, corrective and preventative actions, monitoring opportunities, and evidence of non-compliance.</p>
<p>IAAC-163 MCCN-57</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</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The materials provided by the Proponent in its response to IAAC-163 do not clearly link the summarized changes in habitat types (i.e., land cover classes) to habitat use by migratory bird species</p>	<p>Please clearly identify habitat associations for migratory and non-migratory birds and the land cover classes summarized in the EIS.</p>

	<p>habitat of terrestrial environments and wetlands frequented by migratory birds.</p> <p>i. Provide a summary of potential changes to habitat for migratory birds.</p> <p>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> <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> <p>i. migratory bird species present in the Project area (i.e., as described in Chapter 12 and Appendix N); and</p> <p>ii. bird species of importance to Indigenous Groups, such as Mallard, Common Loon, and Lesser Scaup.</p>	<p>and species of importance to Indigenous Groups. Without this information, it is difficult to evaluate how these VCs will be affected by anticipated Project effects to each habitat type.</p> <p>The Proponent’s summary of potential Project effects and significance of residual effects to wildlife habitat lacks consideration of indirect Project effects. For example, the Proponent has reported a 401 ha (-6.6%) loss of wetland habitat. This fails to consider anticipated indirect effects to 1,263.60 ha of wetland habitat, as reported in the Proponent’s response to IAAC-147. Considered cumulatively, direct and indirect effects to wetland habitat as a result of the Project could result in changes to or the loss of up to 1,664.6 ha (-27.3%) of wetland habitat.</p> <p>As noted in MCCN’s response to IAAC-159, it is important that Indigenous knowledge and participation are included in the development of mitigation and habitat rehabilitation measures, the identification of triggers and thresholds, the implementation of monitoring activities, the evaluation of mitigation and habitat rehabilitation success, and the subsequent development of adaptive management strategies.</p> <p>The materials provided to date have not identified a mechanism for Indigenous participation in the development of mitigation, monitoring and management measures for birds. It is unclear how Indigenous knowledge and input has been considered in the development of mitigation measures for migratory and non-migratory birds. This is important for mitigating impacts to associated Indigenous rights and interests.</p>	<p>Please provide a tabular summary of both direct and indirect effects to habitat classes utilized by migratory and non-migratory birds within the LAA and RAA, including: i) migratory bird species present in the Project area; and ii) bird species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>MCCN requests that mitigations and habitat rehabilitation measures, including triggers and thresholds for management actions, are informed based on traditional use and Indigenous knowledge, as well as scientific information where available.</p> <p>Please identify a process (including sufficient funds for engagement and review) for Indigenous input and participation in the development of mitigation and habitat rehabilitation measures, identification of triggers and thresholds, evaluation of mitigation and habitat rehabilitation success, and development of adaptive management strategies for bird species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p>
<p>IAAC-165 MCCN-56</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</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>While species, such as moose, may typically be considered a habitat generalist, the Proponent’s approach fails to consider the</p>	<p>MCCN requests a more fulsome assessment of potential project effects to moose based on habitat suitability index models. The identification of key habitat (e.g., winter habitat, calving habitat,</p>

	<p>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>	<p>importance of limiting habitat types. For moose, availability of food and climate factors are generally considered most critical during the winter. Mixed stands that provide both food and shelter are particularly important to moose during this season and the conservation of wetlands and riparian areas (including forested buffers) is considered important for maintaining winter habitat values for moose. Direct and indirect effects to these habitats may have a disproportionately high effect on moose distribution and abundance within the PDA, LAA, and RAAs.</p> <p>Mitigation measures identified in the Proponent’s response lack recommended timing restrictions and setback distances for many wildlife species of importance to Indigenous Groups such as moose, black bear, gray wolf, and beaver. The lack of least risk timing windows and special resource value setbacks (e.g., around denning sites for bears or mineral licks and springs for moose), represent a substantial gap.</p> <p>MCCN reiterates our concerns that the materials provided to date have not identified a mechanism for meaningful Indigenous participation in the development and implementation of mitigation measures, monitoring programs, and adaptive management strategies for wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p>	<p>etc.) and the characteristics of these habitats should be informed by Indigenous knowledge.</p> <p>Please provide a map and summary of potential direct and indirect effects to moose habitat (including area and percent change) by habitat suitability score.</p> <p>MCCN reiterates our request that mitigations and habitat rehabilitation measures (including monitoring activities as well as triggers and thresholds for management actions) are informed based on traditional use and Indigenous knowledge, as well as scientific information where available. Please identify a process for Indigenous participation in the development and implementation of these measures.</p>
IAAC-166	<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> <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</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent’s response lacks critical information about the survey effort for woodland caribou studies on which its assessment of potential Project effects is based. Understanding survey effort is key to characterizing the strength and limitations of these conclusions.</p> <p>The Proponent claims that any new information related to woodland caribou distribution will be considered in the Wildlife</p>	<p>Please provide a summary of the field surveys and provincial surveys conducted or reviewed for caribou, including details on the survey method, spatial extent (i.e., location and area surveyed), duration, effort (e.g., number of cameras or transects), and seasonal timing of the surveys.</p> <p>MCCN reiterates our request that monitoring and mitigation measures (including monitoring activities as well as triggers and thresholds for management actions) are informed based on traditional use and Indigenous knowledge, as well as scientific</p>

	<p>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> <p>i. Identify any mitigation measures that account for the uncertainties identified in parts a and b.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Monitoring and Management Plan, and that decision triggers and thresholds for action will be incorporated in this plan. A detailed Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan, however, has yet to be shared with MCCN. MCCN acknowledges receipt of the information on conceptual monitoring and management plans provided in April 2021. This information did not include management or mitigation measures specific to caribou.</p> <p>While the Proponent has noted that planned monitoring activities will be discussed with directly-affected Indigenous Nations, MCCN reiterates our concerns that the Proponent has not identified a mechanism for meaningful Indigenous participation in the development and implementation of mitigation measures, monitoring programs, and adaptive management strategies. This is particularly concerning for boreal caribou, as a species that is listed as threatened under the Species at Risk Act.</p>	<p>information where available. Please identify a process for Indigenous participation in the development and implementation of monitoring and mitigation measures for caribou.</p>
IAAC-167	<p>a. Use the most geographically relevant data and best available information, in the context of caribou management ranges to:</p> <p>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</p> <p>ii. provide all proposed mitigation measures that will be implemented, considering</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The two mitigation measures specific to caribou are insufficient to reduce harm to boreal caribou and their habitats. For example, site preparation activities will only be postponed if boreal caribou are detected within the LAA surrounding the sites. MCCN does not have confidence in the effectiveness of this mitigation measure given the potential for caribou to be present but undetected, and the potential for indirect effects, such as noise, to extend beyond the boundaries of the LAA.</p>	<p>Please include a commitment to schedule site preparation activities to occur outside of the boreal caribou calving and calf-rearing period from May 1 to June 30, regardless of whether caribou have been detected within 1 km of the Project.</p> <p>MCCN reiterates our request that monitoring and mitigation measures (including monitoring activities as well as triggers and thresholds for management actions) are informed based on traditional use and Indigenous knowledge, as well as scientific information where available. Please identify a process for Indigenous participation in the development and</p>

	<p>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> <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>The Proponent notes that mitigation measures and an adaptive management framework will be described in the Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan. MCCN acknowledges receipt of the information on conceptual monitoring and management plans provided in April 2021. This information did not include management or mitigation measures specific to caribou. A detailed Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan has yet to be shared with MCCN.</p> <p>From MCCN’s perspective, the lack of habitat offsetting for impacts to caribou habitat within the Kamuchawie Management Unit represents a substantial gap. The Kamuchawie Management Unit is currently 56% undisturbed habitat for woodland caribou, which is below the Province’s target minimum of 65%. Continued impacts to woodland caribou habitat, however incremental, do not align with goals for the recovery of this species.</p>	<p>implementation of monitoring and mitigation measures for caribou.</p> <p>For any residual Project effects, please identify offset measures to support a net gain of woodland caribou habitat. Please identify how Project effects and anticipated benefits of the offset measures compare in terms of kind, proximity, condition, and quantity (i.e., area).</p>
IAAC-169	<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</p>	<p>Partially adequate.</p> <p>The Proponent has clarified that the effects assessment for the wildlife and wildlife habitat VC incorporated species of importance to Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>MCCN has outstanding concerns with the effects assessment for this VC, including the characterization of effects for species of importance to Indigenous Groups (please see comments on the Proponent’s response to IAAC-165) and the significance criteria applied in the effects assessment. From MCCN’s perspective, it is not consistent with the precautionary approach to only consider an effect significant if it threatens the viability of wildlife and wildlife habitat within the RAA, or the survival and recovery of SAR and SOCC. Impacts to traditional harvesting practices, for example, may be experienced before a species is no longer</p>	<p>Please revise the significance criteria to reflect consideration of potential Project effects to species of importance to Indigenous Groups, including criteria for the maintenance of associated cultural practices.</p>

	Groups. If significance criteria did not include this consideration, update and provide the significance determination with this information.	viable within the RAA. This threshold of significance places wildlife species, and associated Indigenous rights and interests, at an inappropriately high risk.	
IAAC-170 MCCN-102 MCCN-103	<p>a. For the Wildlife Monitoring and Management Plan and sub-plans, provide:</p> <ul 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 subplans:</p> <ul 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>Partially adequate.</p> <p>The Proponent has provided additional description of the plans requested in IACC-170. MCCN also acknowledges receipt of the information on conceptual monitoring and management plans provided in April 2021.</p> <p>Overall, the information provided to date is very general. The details of how monitoring and follow-up will be accomplished, including specific locations of monitoring activities, level of sampling effort, and methods/analyses to be employed are very important and must be subject to careful review by Indigenous Groups.</p> <p>These monitoring plans incorporate the use of triggers and thresholds for determining when actions are required. These triggers and thresholds have yet to be identified and it is unclear how traditional use and Indigenous knowledge will be considered in this process. Similarly, the Proponent has not identified how Indigenous input will be utilized in creating adaptive management strategies where monitoring indicates a need for adaptive management actions.</p> <p>MCCN finds it concerning that no follow up monitoring plan has been developed to validate the future case scenarios for contaminants as identified in the ERA. The other monitoring plans have not been designed to verify the accuracy of the ERA. Without a follow-up program, there is the potential to miss contaminants of potential concern that may, for example, be fleeting in the receiving environment (e.g., PAHs in surface</p>	<p>MCCN looks forward to future review of draft management and monitoring plans and the specific information they include. A much more detailed review will be needed to ensure that the plans address MCCN concerns.</p> <p>MCCN requests the addition of a follow-up monitoring plan to validate the predicted future case scenarios for contaminants as identified in the ERA.</p> <p>MCCN requests that the Proponent identify a process (including sufficient funds for engagement and review) for incorporating community-based monitoring/guardianship, including observations of impacts and concerns, into continued monitoring and adaptive management strategies.</p> <p>MCCN requests that triggers and thresholds for management actions are informed based on traditional use and Indigenous knowledge, as well as scientific information where available. Management and monitoring plans should clearly identify how triggers and thresholds are determined.</p> <p>MCCN requests that the adaptive management framework for each plan be developed utilizing Indigenous input. MCCN input can help identify thresholds, corrective and preventative actions, monitoring opportunities, and evidence of non-compliance.</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.	water), but can accumulate and/or persist more readily in other ecological receptors (e.g., wildlife tissues).	
IAAC-171 MCCN-59 MCCN-60 MCCN-62 MCCN-63 MCCN-64 MCCN-65 MCCN-66 MCCN-74 MCCN-95	<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> <p>i. identify the criteria used to assess socioeconomic conditions;</p> <p>ii. describe the involvement of each Indigenous Group in the regional commercial economy;</p> <p>iii. identify any factors preventing access to employment or other economic opportunities;</p> <p>iv. identify the socio-economic vulnerabilities of the economically marginalized;</p> <p>v. identify the general state of community well-being including the physical and mental health conditions;</p> <p>vi. analyze access to (including potential pressures on) social services and protection facilities in the community; and</p> <p>vii. identify existing infrastructure including access to roads, housing, and additional pressures on infrastructure.</p> <p>c. Describe how Indigenous Group-specific socioeconomic information is considered in the assessment of impacts to Indigenous people and their rights. Describe efforts made</p>	<p>a. Inadequate</p> <p>The Proponent states that the assessment of labor and economy “does not assess or predict direct effects” on Indigenous Nations.</p> <p>However, best practice requires a disaggregated assessment of socio-economic impacts on vulnerable communities, including Indigenous communities (First Nations Major Projects Coalition, 2020).</p> <p>b. Inadequate</p> <p>The Proponent states that “no updates to [the socio-economic] information in the EIS are warranted because Alamos has not received additional information from Indigenous Nations” regarding Indigenous Nation-specific socio-economic conditions (inclusive of items b.i-vii in IAAC-71).</p> <p>However, the Proponent has made no meaningful attempt to collect such information with MCCN (the Proponent’s Indigenous engagement program is not a sufficient mechanism to collect MCCN’s socio-economic information). The Proponent must meaningfully work with MCCN, including provision of sufficient resources, to collect sufficient socio-economic baseline information to support an adequate assessment of effects on MCCN’s socio-economic conditions.</p> <p>c. Inadequate.</p>	<p>Engage meaningfully with MCCN, including the provision of sufficient time and resources, to:</p> <p>i. collect MCCN-specific socio-economic baseline data, and</p> <p>ii. prepare a supplemental filing consisting of an MCCN-specific socio-economic impact assessment report.</p>

	<p>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>	<p>The Proponent states the conclusions of the assessment for Indigenous socio-economic conditions (Volume 2, Chapter 19) and the assessment of current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes (Volume 2, Chapter 17) supported the assessment of Indigenous and Treaty rights (Volume 2, Chapter 19, Section 19.9.3).</p> <p>However, the Proponent has made no meaningful attempt to obtain MCCN-specific socio-economic baseline information. The Proponent’s incorporation of socio-economic information into the assessment of impacts to Indigenous people and their rights is therefore inadequate.</p> <p>d. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “no changes to the conclusions in the EIS are proposed based on the additional information received from Indigenous Nations following the filing of the EIS and summarized in this supplemental filing. The EIS predictions regarding the characterization of residual adverse effects on all VCs and the determinations of significance of residual adverse effects on all VCs remain valid and applicable in consideration of the information received through engagement with Indigenous Nations up to December 31, 2020. No updates to the assessment are warranted based on the information gathered in parts b and c.”</p> <p>The Proponent has made no meaningful attempt to collect MCCN-specific socio-economic information. The EIS conclusions must be revised, as necessary, following the incorporation of sufficient baseline data into the effects assessment.</p> <p>References</p>	
--	---	---	--

		First Nations Major Projects Coalition. (2020). <i>Guidance Appendices to the Major Projects Assessment Standard</i> . https://fnmpc.ca/resources/	
IAAC-173 MCCN-62	<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> <p>i. Include information on adaptive management and associated triggers.</p> <p>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> <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>	<p>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “no follow-up and monitoring programs are proposed” for labour and economy, that “Alamos has not defined targets for local procurement or labour and therefore no specific adaptive management triggers exist,” and that “Alamos does not have targets for local Indigenous participation in the Project.”</p> <p>However, ongoing monitoring of labour and economy effects is required to determine if mitigation and enhancement measures are adequately implemented, to validate assessment predictions and respond to unanticipated effects. Project-specific socio-economic monitoring is best practice (Vanclay, Esteves, Aucamp, & Franks, 2015) and is an increasingly standard aspect of major project development, with many example frameworks and indicators to draw from (Noble, 2020).</p> <p>The Proponent states that “it will implement a number of measures to encourage participation of Indigenous workers and companies.” However, in the absence of targets and ongoing monitoring, it is not possible to assess the efficacy of such measures.</p> <p>b. The Proponent states that “no follow-up and monitoring program is required” for community services, infrastructure and wellbeing because they are monitored by government departments, public agencies and private sector companies.</p>	<p>a. Prepare a detailed project-specific socio-economic effects monitoring plan that includes:</p> <p>i. monitoring of project effects</p> <p>ii. assessment of the efficacy of mitigation and enhancement measures</p> <p>iii. targets for local Indigenous participation and monitoring of Indigenous persons employed by the Project</p> <p>ii. information on adaptive management and associated triggers.</p> <p>b. Describe plans to engage with MCCN in the development and implementation of the project-specific socio-economic effects monitoring plan.</p>

		<p>However, these parties will not monitor the Project-specific socio-economic impacts nor monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed by the Proponent.</p> <p>As noted in comment a. above, socio-economic monitoring is best practice and an increasingly standard aspect of major project development, with many example frameworks and indicators to draw from.</p> <p>c. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent has not provided a plan to engage Indigenous Groups in the development and implementation of the programs outlined in parts a and b.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>Noble B. F. 2020. <i>Follow-up and monitoring in impact assessment: Synthesis of knowledge and practice</i>. Technical research report prepared for the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada. Ottawa, ON. 76p. https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/iaac-acei/documents/research/Follow-up-and-Monitoring-in-Impact-Assessment-Synthesis-of-Knowledge-and-Practice-Noble-2020.pdf</p> <p>Vanclay, F., Esteves, A., Aucamp, I., & Franks, D. (2015). <i>Social Impact Assessment: Guidance for Assessing and Managing the Social Impacts of Projects</i>. International Association for Impact Assessment.</p>	
IAAC-175	a. Describe the criteria used to assess Indigenous health conditions.	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “no new information regarding Indigenous health conditions has been received by Alamos since</p>	a. Engage meaningfully with MCCN, including the provision of sufficient time and resources, to collect baseline information regarding MCCN members’ health conditions.

<p>MCCN-94 MCCN-95 MCCN-96</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>the EIS was submitted and therefore, no updates to the residual effects or cumulative effects on Indigenous health are required.”</p> <p>However, the Proponent has made no meaningful attempt to collect baseline health information from MCCN. Such information is required to inform a meaningful assessment of the Project’s potential impacts on MCCN members’ health conditions.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “the conclusions regarding residual effects to Indigenous health in Volume 2, Chapter 19, Section 19.4.3, and regarding cumulative effects to Indigenous health in Volume 2, Chapter 19, Section 19.5.2 apply equally to all Indigenous Nations engaged on the Project.”</p> <p>However, the Proponent’s assessment does not consider MCCN-specific health baseline information or the results of MCCN’s Indigenous Knowledge and Use Study (provided to the Proponent on June 3, 2021). Such information may reveal unique interactions between the Project and MCCN members’ health conditions. For example, the locations and timing of land and resource use, the species harvested, country foods consumption patterns and underlying health vulnerabilities may differ between MCCN and other Indigenous Nations that are considered in the Proponent’s assessment.</p>	<p>b. Engage meaningfully with MCCN, including the provision of sufficient time and resources, to prepare a supplemental assessment of the Project’s residual and cumulative effects on MCCN members’ health conditions.</p>
<p>IAAC-176 MCCN-83 MCCN-86 MCCN-106 MCCN-107</p>	<p>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> <p>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</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “The Project-specific traditional land and resource use (TLRU) studies provided by Marcel Colomb First Nation and Manitoba Metis Federation confirm that species used in the Baseline Case for traditionally harvested plants and animals are consistent with species of use.”</p>	<p>Review MCCN’s Indigenous Knowledge and Use Study to determine whether the species used in the Baseline Case for COPCs for traditionally harvested plants and animals are consistent with MCCN’s species of use.</p> <p>i. If required, update the Baseline Case to reflect species used by MCCN, or provide a rationale for how the traditionally used plant and animal species used in the Baseline Case allow for a</p>

	<p>in the Baseline Case allow for a robust understanding of the potential effects of COPCs on Indigenous people.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Proponent has not reviewed MCCN’s Indigenous Knowledge and Use Study (provided to the Proponent on June 3, 2021) to determine whether the species used in the Baseline Case for COPCs for traditionally harvested plants and animals are consistent with MCCN’s species of use.</p>	<p>robust understanding of the potential effects of COPCs on MCCN.</p> <p>ii. Update the effects assessment to include information gathered from MCCN, identify any changes to the conclusions of the effects assessments, and identify any additional mitigation measures, as necessary.</p>
IAAC-184 MCCN-67	<p>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.</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>	<p>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project” and that “the information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>MCCN’s TLRU Report identifies important features required for MCCN’s cultural continuity in the Project Footprint and LSA including harvesting sites for various species of berries and medicines, burial sites, camping and cabin sites, gathering places, teaching areas, and terrestrial and water routes. The TLRU Report also identifies intangible elements of MCCN cultural heritage, including knowledge transmission and sense of place.</p> <p>However, the EIS contains no discussion of MCCN’s cultural heritage values or resources of important historical cultural significance in the study area or assessment of the Project’s effects on MCCN’s cultural heritage resources. The EIS is therefore not consistent with MCCN’s TLRU Report.</p> <p>b. Inadequate.</p>	<p>a. Provide updated Project-specific baseline data for MCCN’s physical and cultural heritage resources in the PDA, LAA, and RAA.</p> <p>b. Provide an updated assessment of the Project’s residual and cumulative effects on MCCN’s physical and cultural heritage, including both tangible and intangible elements.</p> <p>c. Engage meaningfully with MCCN, including the provision of sufficient time and resources, to develop a Projects-specific Heritage and Cultural Resource Protection Plan.</p>

		<p>The Proponent states that it has “not received additional information about Indigenous physical and cultural heritage and no new sites have been identified. Therefore, no update to the effects assessment for Indigenous physical and cultural heritage is required at this time.”</p> <p>MCCN provided its TLRU Report to the Proponent on June 3, 2021. The TLRU Report identifies important features required for MCCN’s cultural continuity in the Project Footprint and LSA including harvesting sites for various species of berries and medicines, burial sites, camping and cabin sites, gathering places, teaching areas, and terrestrial and water routes. The TLRU Report also identifies intangible elements of MCCN cultural heritage, including knowledge transmission and sense of place.</p> <p>An updated effects assessment for Indigenous physical and cultural heritage that considers the results of MCCN’s TLRU report is required to understand the potential effects of the Project on MCCN’s physical and cultural heritage.</p> <p>c. Inadequate</p> <p>The Proponent indicates an commitment to consider “mitigation measures proposed by Indigenous Nations.”</p> <p>However, the Proponent does not describe how it will seek such proposals from Indigenous Nations.</p> <p>d. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “No additional information regarding physical and cultural heritage resources has been received by Alamos. Therefore, no updates to the baseline data for physical and cultural heritage resources in the PDA, LAA, and RAA are</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>required and no changes to the conclusions of the EIS are necessary.”</p> <p>However, MCCN provided its TLRU Report to the Proponent on June 3, 2021. The TLRU Report identifies important features required for MCCN’s cultural continuity in the Project Footprint and LSA including harvesting sites for various species of berries and medicines, burial sites, camping and cabin sites, gathering places, teaching areas, and terrestrial and water routes. The TLRU Report also identifies intangible elements of MCCN cultural heritage, including knowledge transmission and sense of place.</p> <p>An updated effects assessment for Indigenous physical and cultural heritage that considers the results of MCCN’s TLRU report is required to understand the potential effects of the Project on MCCN’s physical and cultural heritage.</p>	
IAAC-186	<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>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>However, the EIS contains no discussion of MCCN’s cultural heritage values or resources of important historical cultural significance in the study area or assessment of the Project’s effects on MCCN’s cultural heritage resources. The EIS is therefore not consistent with MCCN’s TLRU Report.</p>	<p>a. See MCCN’s comments on the Proponent’s responses to IAAC-185</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>	<p>b. Inadequate</p> <p>The Proponent states that it will develop a Heritage and Cultural Resource Protection Plan (HCRPP) to mitigate heritage and cultural resources discovered or disturbed during Project construction and operation.”</p> <p>However, the Proponent does not identify how it will collaborate with MCCN to prepare the HCRPP.</p> <p>c. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “no cultural or spiritual sites have been identified in the Project Development Area (PDA) or Local Assessment Area (LAA), therefore no direct or indirect effects on cultural and spiritual sites are anticipated.”</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TLRU Report identifies important features required for MCCN’s cultural continuity in the Project Footprint and LSA including harvesting sites for various species of berries and medicines, burial sites, camping and cabin sites, gathering places, teaching areas, and terrestrial and water routes. The TLRU Report also identifies intangible elements of MCCN cultural heritage, including knowledge transmission and sense of place.</p> <p>d. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “No new information regarding Indigenous cultural and spiritual sites has been received by Alamos to date and therefore no update to the conclusions of the EIS is required.</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TLRU Report identifies important features required for MCCN’s cultural continuity in the Project Footprint and LSA including harvesting sites for various species of berries</p>	
--	--	--	--

		and medicines, burial sites, camping and cabin sites, gathering places, teaching areas, and terrestrial and water routes. The TLRU Report also identifies intangible elements of MCCN cultural heritage, including knowledge transmission and sense of place.	
IAAC-187 MCCN-51 MCCN-58 MCCN-61 MCCN-70	<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>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “Information has been obtained from Indigenous Nations through Project-specific TLRU studies and the Indigenous engagement program for the Project has largely served to confirm the selection of spatial and temporal boundaries.” The Proponent further states that “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TLRU Report identifies spatial boundaries that differ from the spatial boundaries applied in the EIS.</p>	Identify and describe any disparity between the views of MCCN 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.
IAAC-188 MCCN-69	<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>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “Intangible effects can only be meaningfully evaluated by individuals and communities experiencing these values in their cultural context; however, such effects are difficult to mitigate or quantitatively assess by an external party. Where an Indigenous Nation identified a related concern, the subjective and experiential components of current use that could not be measured or meaningfully assessed from a Western science perspective were considered narratively.” The Proponent further states that “The methods</p>	See MCCN’s comment on the Proponent’s response to IAAC-199

		<p>applied reflect standard environmental assessment methods appropriate for the scope and nature of the Project.”</p> <p>However, the Proponent’s admittedly insufficient “narrative” consideration of impacts on intangible elements of current use is not aligned with current guidance and best practice.</p> <p><i>IAAC’s Technical Guidance for assessing the Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012</i> states “the use of the lands and resources by Aboriginal peoples may have tangible values (e.g., wildlife species or traditional plants) and/or intangible values (e.g., quiet enjoyment of the landscape or sites used for teachings). Intangible values are often linked with spiritual, artistic, aesthetic and educational elements that are often associated with the identity of Aboriginal groups.”</p> <p>While, as the Proponent notes, “such effects are difficult to mitigate or quantitatively assess by an external party,” appropriate social science methods such as ethnography, interviews, focus groups, grounded theory, and constructed scales can be applied by or in collaboration with communities (McCormack 2016; Satterfield 2013).</p> <p>Additionally, the Proponent states that “No additional information regarding intangible values has been received by Alamos.</p> <p>However, MCCN provided its TLRU Report to the Proponent on June 3, 2021. The TLRU Report identifies intangible elements of MCCN’s current use, including knowledge transmission and sense of place, that have the potential to be adversely impacted by the Project.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>References</p> <p>McCormack, P. 2016. Doing Credible Cultural Assessment: Applied Social Science. <i>Environmental Practice</i>, 18(3): 148-65.</p> <p>Satterfield, T. 2013. Culture, intangibles and metrics in environmental management. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i>, 117: 103-14.</p>	
IAAC-192 MCCN-45	<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 Constitution Act, 1982.</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>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TRLU Report identifies specific MCCN fishing values within the study area that have not been assessed in the EIS.</p>	See MCCN’s comment on the Proponent’s response to IAAC-199

	<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</p>		
IAAC-193	<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> <p>i. Explain how this may affect the exercise of the rights of Indigenous people.</p> <p>ii. Update the effects assessment with this information and identify any mitigation measures, as required.</p>	<p>Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “adverse effects on fish health, growth, or survival from changes in water quality downstream of the MacLellan and the Gordon sites are not expected. Given that and the conclusions stated above that the dissolved chemical concentrations in the water are not expected to alter the abundance or distribution of fish that could be harvested for subsistence purposes, effects to the exercise of Indigenous or Treaty rights are not anticipated.”</p> <p>However, this conclusion does not consider potential avoidance of fishing locations due to perceived contamination in fish as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p>	See MCCN’s comment on the Proponent’s response to IAAC-199

		<p>However, MCCN’s TLRU Report provides information about specific fishing values in the study area that were not assessed in the EIS, including potential avoidance of fish harvesting activities as a result of loss of confidence in the quality of resources.</p>	
<p>IAAC-194 MCCN-51</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> <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>	<p>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “Volume 2, Chapter 17 of the EIS, Sections 17.4.2 and 17.4.3 assess the pathway of effects on vegetation and wetlands on current use including changes to availability of and access to resources and harvesting areas.” The Proponent’s response identifies site clearing and sensory disturbance as primary effects pathways.</p> <p>However, neither the EIS nor the Proponent’s response to IAAC-194 identify the full pathways of effects between project-related changes to vegetation and current use effects, including real and perceived contamination of harvestable vegetation.</p> <p>MCCN’s TLRUS Report identifies harvesting sites for blueberries and cranberries in the Project Footprint and harvesting sites for various species of berries (blueberry, cranberry, and raspberry) and medicines in the LSA. The TLRUS identifies potential Project interactions with vegetation harvesting resulting from site clearing and diminished confidence in the health and integrity of medicines and other valued plant resources due to the potential dispersion of industrial contaminants (e.g., air pollution and airborne dust).</p> <p>The Proponent has not adequately assessed or mitigated potential effects of the Project on MCCN’s vegetation harvesting activities.</p> <p>b. Inadequate.</p>	<p>See MCCN’s comment on the Proponent’s response to IAAC-199</p>

		<p>The Proponent states that “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TLRUS Report provides information about MCCN members’ plant harvesting activities in the Project Footprint and LAA that have not been assessed in the EIS. The EIS is therefore not consistent with MCCN’s TLRUS Report.</p>	
IAAC-195	<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</p>	<p>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states “Volume 2, Chapter 12. Volume 2, Chapter 17, Sections 17.1.4, 17.4.2, and 17.5.5 assesses these changes [change to availability and access] in the context of effects on the experience of Indigenous peoples which adversely alter the perceived values of current use resources, sites or areas that may result in avoidance.”</p> <p>However, section 17.4.5 and 17.5.5 of the EIS consider only sensory disturbance “narratively,” i.e. the EIS documents statements provided by MCCN but without providing any assessment of the effects of changes in the sensory environment on MCCN’s current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>MCCN’s TLRUS Study identifies pathways of effects that have not been assessed either in the EIS or in the Proponent’s response to IAAC-195, including avoidance of traditional hunting and trapping areas due to safety concerns in the vicinity of mining operations, avoidance of hunting and trapping due to concerns</p>	See MCCN’s comment on the Proponent’s response to IAAC-199

	<p>on Indigenous Groups' use and rights related to wildlife and wildlife habitat.</p>	<p>about contamination, and avoidance of current use areas due to degraded experience.</p> <p>b. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states "Given that measurable changes in the abundance and distribution of wildlife in the LAA is not anticipated, population levels effects on wildlife are also not anticipated, resulting in low magnitude effects on the availability of and access to traditionally harvested species."</p> <p>The Proponent's characterization of the magnitude of effects on current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes does not take into consideration the full range of pathways of effects, including MCCN members' potential avoidance of hunting and trapping areas dues to concerns about safety, concerns about contamination and degraded experience.</p> <p>c. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states "This information [regarding species of importance, traditional ecological knowledge and concerns relating to potential Project-related environmental effects] was cross-referenced in the assessment through the determination of project pathways, mitigation measures, and identification and characterization of residual effects."</p> <p>However, neither the EIS nor the Proponent's response to IAAC-195 includes information contained in MCCN's TLRUS Study, provided to the Proponent on June 3, 2021.</p>	
<p>IAAC-196 MCCN-19</p>	<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 Constitution Act,</p>	<p>a. Partially adequate.</p> <p>While the Proponent states that the EIS considered the effects of habitat avoidance (due to Project-related noise and activity) on</p>	<p>See MCCN's comment on the Proponent's response to IAAC-199</p>

	<p>1982. Update the effects assessment with this information and identify any mitigation measures as required.</p>	<p>current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, the EIS does not adequately characterize such effects. The EIS rates the magnitude of residual effects on current use as low because “with mitigation, the change in resource availability is anticipated to be low, as the Project is not expected to cause population levels effects, despite some mortalities and displacement.”</p> <p>However, “population level effects” on wildlife is not the only, or even necessarily most important, consideration with regard to effects on current use. Localized wildlife mortality and displacement is relevant in the context of adverse effects on preferred harvesting locations and timing for current use.</p> <p>Additionally, the Proponent does not consider the full range of pathways of effects on current use.</p>	
<p>IAAC-199 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</p>	<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</p>	<p>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TLRU Report provides information that has not been considered in the EIS or the Proponent’s response to IAAC-199, including specific hunting, trapping, fishing and gathering values, intangible dimensions of cultural use, and effects interaction pathways. The EIS is therefore not consistent with MCCN’s TLRUS Report. Furthermore, the Proponent has not engaged MCCN to incorporate valued species into the</p>	<p>Engage meaningfully with MCCN, including the provision of sufficient time and resources, to prepare a supplementary assessment of the Project’s residual and cumulative effects on MCCN’s current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes. The supplementary assessment must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Be based on the results of MCCN’s TLRUS Report ii. Use methods developed by, or in collaboration with MCCN, including identification of VCs, indicators, study boundaries, residual effects characterization criteria, and significance thresholds iii. Apply mitigation measures specific to potential impacts on MCCN’s current use. iv. Assess project-specific effects in the context of cumulative pressures and trends over time.

<p>MCCN-92 MCCN-94</p>	<p>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>	<p>assessment, or develop residual effects characterization or significance criteria.</p> <p>b. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TLRU Report identifies specific, relevant information that has not been considered in the EIS or in the Proponent’s response to IAAC-199.</p> <p>c. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “Alamos has offered many opportunities for Indigenous Nations to provide input, including sharing Project documentation and sections of the draft Indigenous or Treaty rights assessment. Alamos received no comments on the methodology used or the outcomes of analysis prior to or following the filing of the EIS.”</p> <p>However, MCCN provided the Proponent with comments on the EIS on October 10, 2020 and comments on the Proponent’s responses to MCCN’s comments on July 30, 2021. MCCN’s comments have identified numerous issues with EIS methodology and outcomes, and include MCCN’s requirement to “provide a supplementary submission that sets out an appropriate methodological approach to Rights Based Methodology, taking into consideration approaches already well-established in federal impact assessment” (MCCN-90).</p>	
----------------------------	---	--	--

<p>IAAC-200</p> <p>MCCN-99</p> <p>MCCN-100</p> <p>MCCN-101</p> <p>MCCN-102</p> <p>MCCN-103</p> <p>MCCN-104</p> <p>MCCN-105</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>i. cultural heritage resources and sites of significance;</p> <p>ii. current use of resources for traditional purposes; and</p> <p>iii. Indigenous peoples’ health and socioeconomic conditions.</p> <p>b. Explain how the proponent will share monitoring results with Indigenous Groups and how feedback will be managed.</p> <p>c. Provide an outline of and rationale for the complaint/grievance mechanism(s) that will be developed for this Project.</p> <p>d. Describe the protocol for notifying Indigenous Groups of accidents and malfunctions during all phases of the Project.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent’s commitment to “engage with Indigenous Nations,” “discuss planned monitoring activities,” and “provide opportunities for Indigenous Nations to participate,” in monitoring and follow-up programs is welcome, but insufficiently specific.</p> <p>MCCN requires meaningful participation in the development of relevant monitoring and follow-up plans, including development of specific mitigation measures, monitoring parameters, thresholds, and an adaptive management framework.</p> <p>Additionally, the Proponent states that it provided MCCN with responses to “MCCN-99, MCCN-100, MCCN-101, MCCN-102, MCCN-103, MCCN-104, and MCCN-105.” However, the Proponent has not provided MCCN with any responses to MCCN-99 and MCCN-100 and MCCN has determined that the Proponent’s responses to MCCN’s other comments are inadequate.</p> <p>b. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “a standard communication procedure will be established to provide data, distribute information, and accept inquiries from Indigenous Nations.”</p> <p>Further information is required to assess whether the communication procedure will be sufficient (e.g. will materials be translated, provided in plain text, disseminated through a variety of media, etc.).</p> <p>c. Inadequate.</p>	<p>Provide a commitment to engage meaningfully with MCCN, including the provisions of sufficient time and resources, to develop relevant monitoring and follow-up plans, including development of specific mitigation measures, monitoring parameters, thresholds, and an adaptive management framework.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>rationale for conclusions on matters for which any disparity in views remains.</p>	<p>The Proponent does not indicate how the complaint resolution process will be documented and communicated.</p> <p>Best practice requires establishment of a specific grievance mechanism that is culturally-appropriate, transparent, legitimate, accessible, holistic, predictable, equitable and rights-compatible (International Council on Mining and Metals 2020).</p> <p>d. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent’s response does not indicate that accidents and malfunctions will be communicated immediately to MCCN.</p> <p>e. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent’s response does not indicate how proposed mitigation measures address MCCN’s specific concerns about the Project, including concerns raised in MCCN’s TLRUS Report (provided to MCCN on June 3, 2021).</p> <p>f. Inadequate.</p> <p>MCCN provided comments on the Proponent’s draft conceptual environmental management and monitoring plans on August 19, 2021. MCCN requires meaningful engagement in ongoing development of the environmental management and monitoring plans, including sufficient time and resources to support MCCN’s participation.</p> <p>References</p> <p>International Council on Mining and Metals. 2020. Tool 13 – Designing and Implementing Grievance Mechanisms. In Good Practice Guide to Indigenous Peoples and Mining. https://guidance.miningwithprinciples.com/good-practice-guide-</p>	
--	---	---	--

		indigenous-peoples-and-mining/tool-13-designing-and-implementing-grievance-mechanisms/	
IAAC-202 MCCN-12 MCCN-13 MCCN-14 MCCN-16 MCCN-93	<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 Constitution Act, 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> <p>i. VCs related to the Indigenous Group’s Section 35 Rights of the Constitution Act, 1982, including potential or established rights, title, and related interests, that may be impacted by the Project;</p> <p>ii. the conditions that are needed to support each VC for the exercise of Section 35 Rights of the Constitution Act, 1982, and how past, current, and reasonably foreseeable activities affect or will affect these conditions;</p> <p>iii. the general (or specific) geographic area where the Indigenous Group exercises Section 35 Rights of the Constitution Act, 1982; and</p> <p>iv. how the Project affects each VC identified, related to the Indigenous Groups’ exercise of Section 35 Rights of the Constitution Act, 1982.</p>	<p>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>However, MCCN’s TLRU Report identifies specific, relevant information that has not been assessed in the EIS or the Proponent’s response to IAAC-202. The EIS is therefore not consistent with MCCN’s TLRU Report.</p> <p>Additionally, the Proponent states that it has responded to “MCCN-12, MCCN-13, MCCN-14, MCCN-16, and MCCN-93.” However, the Proponent has not provided responses to MCCN-14, MCCN-16 or MCCN-93.</p> <p>b. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states “No new information regarding assessment of impacts to Indigenous and Treaty rights has been received by Alamos since the EIS was submitted and therefore, no updates to the assessment of Indigenous and Treaty rights, including effects to VCs related to Indigenous and Treaty rights, conditions needed to support the exercise of Indigenous and</p>	<p>Engage meaningfully with MCCN, including the provision of sufficient time and resources, to prepare a supplementary assessment of the Project’s residual and cumulative effects on MCCN’s Aboriginal and Treaty rights. The supplementary assessment must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Be based on the results of MCCN’s TLRUS Report ii. Use methods developed by, or in collaboration with MCCN, including identification of VCs, indicators, study boundaries, residual effects characterization criteria, and significance thresholds iii. Apply mitigation and accommodation measures specific to potential impacts on MCCN’s Treaty and Aboriginal rights. iv. Assess project-specific effects in the context of cumulative pressures and trends over time.

	<p>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 Constitution Act, 1982. Criteria could consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the nature of rights ii. regional/historic/cumulative impacts iii. cultural landscape iv. preferred expression of rights <p>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 Constitution Act, 1982, 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.</p> <p>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 Constitution Act, 1982, efforts made to reconcile the disparities, and rationale for conclusions on matters for which disparity in views remains.</p> <p>f. Describe mitigation measures that specifically address potential impacts to the Section 35 Rights of the Constitution Act, 1982, to each Indigenous Group. Include any commitments that would seek to avoid, mitigate or</p>	<p>Treaty rights, or geographic area where Indigenous and Treaty rights are exercised are necessary.”</p> <p>However, MCCN provided the Proponent with comments on the EIS on October 10, 2020 and comments on the Proponent’s responses to MCCN’s comments on July 30, 2021. MCCN’s comments identified numerous issues with EIS methodology and outcomes, and include MCCN’s requirement to “provide a supplementary submission that sets out an appropriate methodological approach to Rights Based Methodology, taking into consideration approaches already well-established in federal impact assessment” (MCCN-90).</p> <p>In addition, MCCN provided the Proponent with MCCN’s TLRUS Report on June 3, 2021. The TLRUS Report documents MCCN values that are relevant to the practice of MCCN’s Treaty and Aboriginal rights that have the potential to be adversely impacted by the Project.</p> <p>c. Inadequate.</p> <p>MCCN did not have an opportunity to validate criteria to assess the severity of impacts on its Treaty and Aboriginal rights prior to preparation of the effects assessment.</p> <p>d. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “Residual effects on Indigenous and Treaty rights for each Indigenous Nation is presented in Volume 2, Chapter 19, Section 19.9.3 of the EIS.”</p> <p>However, the assessment provided in Section 19.9.3.2 of the EIS does not characterize effects on MCCN’s Treaty and Aboriginal rights against all the criteria identified in Table 19-11 (Section</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>reduce potential impacts to the rights of Indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>19.9.1.5 of the EIS), including: Equity, Cultural Wellbeing, Governance, Health, and Cumulative Impacts Context.</p> <p>e. Inadequate.</p> <p>The proponent states “the information provided by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation in the TLRU Report serves to confirm the assumptions made in the EIS regarding the nature and extent of Indigenous traditional use in relation to the Project. The information shared by Mathias Colomb Cree Nation is consistent with the EIS.”</p> <p>MCCN’s TLRUS Report documents MCCN values that are relevant to the practice of MCCN’s Treaty and Aboriginal rights that have the potential to be adversely impacted by the Project. These values have not been considered either in the EIS or in the Proponent’s response to IAAC-202. The EIS is therefore not consistent with MCCN’s TLRUS Report.</p> <p>In addition, MCCN provided the Proponent with comments on the EIS on October 10, 2020 and comments on the Proponent’s responses to MCCN’s comments on July 30, 2021. MCCN’s comments identified numerous issues with EIS methodology and outcomes, and include MCCN’s requirement to “provide a supplementary submission that sets out an appropriate methodological approach to Rights Based Methodology, taking into consideration approaches already well-established in federal impact assessment” (MCCN-90). The Proponent has not addressed MCCN’s comments regarding its issues and concerns with the Proponent’s Indigenous rights assessment., including MCCN-90, MCCN-91, MCCN-92 and MCCN-93.</p> <p>f. Inadequate.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		The Proponent does not identify how its proposed mitigation measures apply to specific effects of the Project on MCCN’s Treaty and Aboriginal rights.	
IAAC-204	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 Constitution Act, 1982, 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>a. Inadequate.</p> <p>The Proponent states “No new information regarding assessment of impacts to Indigenous and Treaty rights has been received by Alamos since the EIS was submitted and therefore, no updates to the assessment of Indigenous and Treaty rights, including methods, thresholds, significance determination and mitigation and monitoring are required.”</p> <p>However, MCCN provided the Proponent with its TLRUS report on June 3, 2021. MCCN’s TLRUS Report documents MCCN values that are relevant to the practice of MCCN’s Treaty and Aboriginal rights that have the potential to be adversely impacted by the Project. These values have not been considered either in the EIS or in the Proponent’s response to IAAC-204.</p> <p>In addition, MCCN provided the Proponent with comments on the EIS on October 10, 2020 and comments on the Proponent’s responses to MCCN’s comments on July 30, 2021. MCCN’s comments identified numerous issues with EIS methodology and outcomes, and include MCCN’s requirement to “provide a supplementary submission that sets out an appropriate methodological approach to Rights Based Methodology, taking into consideration approaches already well-established in federal impact assessment” (MCCN-90). The Proponent has not addressed MCCN’s comments regarding its issues and concerns with the Proponent’s Indigenous rights assessment., including MCCN-90, MCCN-91, MCCN-92 and MCCN-93.</p>	See MCCN’s comments on the Proponent’s response to IAAC-202