

**BRANCH OFFICE**

Wabun Tribal Council  
313 Railway Street  
Timmins, ON P4N 2P4  
705-268-9066  
705-268-8554

**HEAD OFFICE**

Mattagami First Nation  
P.O. Box 99  
Gogama, ON P0M 1W0  
705-894-2072  
705-894-2887

IAAC-AEIC, Ontario Regional Office  
600-55 York Street  
Toronto, ON, M5J 1R7  
Larissa.Goshulak@iaac-aeic.gc.ca  
437-518-5692

June 10, 2026

**Wabun Tribal Council Submission on the Draft Impact Assessment Report and Draft Conditions  
for the Crawford Nickel Project**

Dear Larissa Goshulak,

This letter and the information contained within outlines Wabun Tribal Council's assessment of the draft Impact Assessment Report (IAR) and potential conditions, released for comment in May 2026, regarding the proposed Crawford Nickel Project located within Treaty 9 territory. Wabun Tribal Council (WTC) is providing these comments as part of the formal record and within the prescribed IAAC comment period.

Wabun Tribal Council has identified concerns in several key areas, including Indigenous participation in project oversight and decision-making; impacts to fish and fish habitat; impacts to migratory birds and species at risk; protocol related to accidents and malfunctions; and the need for clearer, enforceable requirements related to monitoring, reporting, adaptive management, and accountability. These concerns align with Wabun Tribal Council's priorities of ensuring meaningful Indigenous involvement throughout the project lifecycle, protecting section 35 rights and the environment, and establishing enforceable conditions.

In several instances, the draft conditions rely on broad or non-specific language that may create uncertainty regarding implementation, compliance, and enforcement. Wabun Tribal Council is concerned that the conditions, as currently drafted, do not provide sufficient clarity regarding process expectations, decision-making, or Indigenous involvement.

As conditions will be the primary mechanism carried forward throughout the life of the project, regardless of future ownership, operators, or changes in project governance, it is critical that they be robust, clear, and enforceable. Now that Wabun Tribal Council's comments have been submitted, **we look forward to meeting with the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada on June 15<sup>th</sup> to discuss revisions to the draft conditions.**

Wabun Tribal Council is seeking a constructive, good-faith discussion on how the conditions can be strengthened to better address identified concerns and anticipated impacts and provide greater certainty regarding implementation and accountability. We expect the Agency to work collaboratively with WTC to ensure that the final conditions reflect the issues raised throughout the impact assessment process and provide meaningful protections over the full life cycle of the Project.

## Wabun Tribal Council’s Comments, Concerns, and Recommendations on the Draft Impact Assessment Report and Draft Conditions

Table 1 below identifies WTC’s recommended revisions to the wording of existing conditions, as well as requests for additional conditions where gaps have been identified. The corresponding draft condition numbers are provided in the left column. For the requested new conditions, WTC has assigned condition numbers consistent with the numbering in the Draft Conditions document. All additions and revisions have been added in **bold**.

Table 2 provides specific review comments related to the Draft IAR, including requests for additional assessment and revisions to the IAR. Table 2 also provides context and rationale for the recommended revisions and additions to the Draft Conditions outlined in Table 1.

*Table 1. WTC's Recommended Change to the Draft Conditions*

<b>Draft Condition Number/ New Condition Number</b>	<b>Current Condition Wording</b>	<b>Requested Revisions or Additions</b>
<b>2 – Consultation</b>		
Condition 2.2.4	The Proponent shall, where consultation is a requirement of a condition set out in this document: advise as soon as feasible in writing the parties being consulted on how the views and information received have, or have not, been integrated into the subject matter of the consultation by the Proponent and provide a justification as to why views and information received have not been integrated into the subject matter of the consultation.	The Proponent shall, where consultation is a requirement of a condition set out in this document: advise as soon as feasible in writing the parties being consulted on how the views and information received have, or have not, been integrated into the subject matter of the consultation by the Proponent. This should include justification as to why views and information received have not been integrated into the subject matter of the consultation, <b>including a description of any changes made as a result of the consultation.</b>

<b>2 – Change to the Designated Project</b>		
Proposed additional Condition 2.16	N/A	<b>Any current and future Proponent or Operator shall comply with all Conditions imposed in respect to the Project.</b>
Proposed additional Condition 2.17	N/A	<b>The Proponent shall facilitate relationship building between any new Proponent and affected Indigenous communities to ensure a smooth transition of management and implementation and continued execution of mitigation measures.</b>
<b>3 – Fish and Fish Habitat</b>		
Proposed additional Conditions 3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.3	N/A	<p><b>The Proponent shall, in consultation with Indigenous groups and relevant authorities, develop before construction and implement throughout the Designated Project, including closure, a follow-up program to verify impact predictions and mitigation effectiveness for effects on fish and fish habitat from surface water quantity changes associated with open pit groundwater drawdown and dewatering. The Proponent shall:</b></p> <p><b>3.5.1 establish hydrological monitoring stations in nearby and more distant watercourses to assess project-related hydrological effects within the PA, LSA, and RSA.</b></p> <p><b>3.5.2 establish water level thresholds and triggers to ensure mitigation measures are implemented before harm occurs to fish, fish habitat, or other aquatic organisms.</b></p> <p><b>3.5.3 include Indigenous monitors in program implementation to help identify risks to section 35 rights resulting from project-related water level reductions.</b></p>

Proposed additional Condition 3.6	N/A	<p>The Proponent shall prepare, prior to construction, and implement throughout all phases of the Project, a water discharge monitoring plan for water pumped from the open pit, and share the plan with Indigenous groups and relevant authorities. The plan shall ensure that water withdrawal and discharge activities do not adversely affect fish, fish habitat, or water quality and quantity. Discharge locations shall be selected in consultation with Indigenous groups and qualified environmental professionals.</p>
Proposed additional Condition 3.7, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, and 3.7.3	N/A	<p>The Proponent shall, prior to constructing or realigning Highway 655, the rail spur, water management facilities, diversion channels, or other infrastructure, conduct fisheries assessments at all water crossings to determine fish-bearing status and inform crossing design and mitigation measures. The Proponent shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.7.1 use qualified environmental professionals to identify crossings containing sensitive fish habitat;</li> <li>3.7.2 adhere to applicable fish timing windows for in-water works; and</li> <li>3.7.3 consult Indigenous groups on offsetting measures for any harmful alteration, disruption, or destruction of fish habitat resulting from crossing installation.</li> </ul>
Condition 3.2	<p>The Proponent shall manage potential mine effluents, during the construction and operation phases of the Designated Project and in consultation with relevant authorities. In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.2.1 continually refine the site water quality model with predictions for contaminants of potential</li> </ul>	<p>The Proponent shall manage potential mine effluents (<b>both controlled and uncontrolled sources</b>), during the construction and operation phases of the Designated Project and in consultation with relevant authorities. In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.2.1 continually refine the site water quality model with predictions for contaminants of potential</li> </ul>

	<p>concern, based on ongoing geochemical testing throughout construction and operation, and adapt the mine waste management plan prior to final closure; and</p> <p>3.2.2 maintain space for contingency measures, including pump-back wells, interceptor well systems and hydraulic barrier systems, around sources of seepage including the tailings management facility, the impoundment facility and ore stockpiles.</p>	<p>concern, based on ongoing geochemical testing throughout construction and operation, and adapt the mine waste management plan prior to final closure;</p> <p><b>3.2.2 attempt to identify the release points of any uncontrolled effluent into the natural environment and subsequently determine the potential risk for contamination of fish and fish habitat;</b> and</p> <p>3.2.3 maintain space for contingency measures, including pump-back wells, interceptor well systems and hydraulic barrier systems, around sources of seepage, including the tailings management facility, the impoundment facility and ore stockpiles.</p>
Condition 3.3	<p>The Proponent shall develop prior to the construction of the North Driftwood River Diversion Channel and in consultation with Indigenous groups and Fisheries and Oceans Canada and implement during the construction and operation of the North Driftwood River Diversion Channel, a follow-up program to determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures implemented to restore and develop fish habitat in the North Driftwood River Diversion Channel. In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>3.3.1 assess whether the restored and developed habitat are functioning as the intended fish habitat; and</p> <p>3.3.2 seek opportunities for the participation of interested Indigenous groups.</p>	<p>The Proponent shall develop, prior to the construction of the North Driftwood River Diversion Channel and in consultation with Indigenous groups and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, and implement during the construction and operation of the North Driftwood River Diversion Channel, a follow-up program. The program will determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures implemented to restore and develop fish habitat in the North Driftwood River Diversion Channel, <b>as well as any other new or restored fish or wildlife habitat associated with offsetting measures for the project.</b> In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>3.3.1 assess whether the restored and developed habitat are functioning as the intended fish <b>and/or wildlife</b> habitat; and</p> <p>3.3.2 seek opportunities for the participation of interested Indigenous groups.</p> <p><b>3.3.3 Determine species for the assessment pursuant to Condition 5.8, targeting species of traditional or cultural importance and/or species at risk to better</b></p>

		<b>align with multi-species offsetting needs and provincial/federal guidance and requirements.</b>
Condition 3.4	<p>The Proponent shall develop, prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups and relevant authorities, and implement, during all phases of the Designated Project, a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects from the Designated Project on fish and fish habitat resulting from changes to surface water quality from sources of seepage, including the tailings management facility, impoundment facility and ore stockpiles. In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>3.4.1. monitor concentrations of contaminants of potential concern, including chromium VI, cobalt, copper, nitrate-N, nitrite-N, selenium, uranium, vanadium and zinc at the seepage face in the North Driftwood River (including headwater lakes), West Buskegau River, and Jocko Creek;</p> <p>3.4.2. demonstrate that concentrations level identified through monitoring referred to in condition 3.4.1 do not cause acute or chronic toxicity to fish; and</p> <p>3.4.3. implement, if needed to avoid acute or chronic toxicity to fish, modified or additional mitigation measures pursuant to condition 2.7.4 and 3.2.2, such as pump-back wells, interceptor well systems, groundwater cutoff walls, and permeable reactive barrier systems. The Proponent</p>	<p>The Proponent shall develop, prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups and relevant authorities, and implement, during all phases of the Designated Project, a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects from the Designated Project on fish and fish habitat resulting from changes to surface water quality from sources of seepage, including the tailings management facility, impoundment facility, and ore stockpiles. <b>The follow-up program shall also aim to identify and monitor all potential release points of uncontrolled effluent into the natural environment, to minimize impacts to water quality in the North Driftwood River (and headwater lakes), West Buskegau River, and Jocko Creek watersheds.</b></p> <p>In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>3.4.1 monitor concentrations of contaminants of potential concern, including chromium VI, cobalt, copper, nitrate-N, nitrite-N, selenium, uranium, vanadium and zinc at the seepage face in the North Driftwood River (including headwater lakes), West Buskegau River, and Jocko Creek;</p> <p>3.4.2 demonstrate that concentrations level identified though monitoring referred to in condition 3.4.1 do not cause acute or chronic toxicity to fish;</p> <p>3.4.3 <b>demonstrate that concentrations level identified through monitoring referred to in condition 3.4.1 do not pose a potential risk to</b></p>

	<p>shall submit these measures to the Agency before implementing them.</p>	<p><b>human health through consumption of the fish species being sampled; and</b></p> <p>3.4.4 implement, if needed to avoid acute or chronic toxicity to fish <b>and potential risk to human health</b>, modified or additional mitigation measures pursuant to condition 2.7.4 and 3.2.2, such as pump-back wells, interceptor well systems, groundwater cutoff walls, and permeable reactive barrier systems. The Proponent shall submit these measures to the Agency before implementing them.</p> <p>3.4.5 <b>monitor incidental mortalities of piscivorous species at risk and species of traditional or cultural importance within the PA for contaminant bioaccumulation associated with HADD of fish habitat, including bald eagle, waterfowl, and otter.</b></p>
<p><b>4 – Migratory Birds</b></p>		
<p>Condition 4.2 and Proposed additional Conditions 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5</p>	<p>The Proponent shall determine, under the direction of a qualified individual and using non-intrusive methods selected based on habitat type, the presence, or likely presence of migratory bird nest(s) protected under the <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994</i> and its regulations and residences protected under the <i>Species at Risk Act</i> that may be adversely affected by any Designated Project activity prior to initiating the activity.</p>	<p>The Proponent shall determine, <b>by employing</b> a qualified individual and using non-intrusive methods selected based on habitat type, the presence, or likely presence of migratory bird nest(s) protected under the <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994</i> and its regulations and residences protected under the <i>Species at Risk Act</i> that may be adversely affected by any Designated Project activity prior to initiating the activity.</p> <p><b>When determining presence, or likely presence of migratory bird nest(s), qualified personnel shall apply an adaptive, precautionary approach that accounts for temporal changes in detectability, variations in habitat type and quality, density of vegetation growth, weather, and surveyor</b></p>

		<p>experience. Where detectability is compromised by these variables, the presence of nest(s) should be assumed and appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures be applied.</p> <p><b>4.2.1. Nest surveys are to be completed in the weeks prior to and following the General Nesting Period (as defined by Environment and Climate Change Canada, for the applicable project zone) to confirm whether active breeding is taking place wherever vegetation or ground disturbance is required (e.g., until there is reasonable assurance that no nesting is occurring).</b></p> <p><b>4.2.2. Nest surveys are to be considered valid for up to two days prior to disturbance (if completed within the General Nesting Period as defined in 4.2.1), as some species may initiate egg laying activities in as little as two to three days (i.e., if disturbance does not occur within 48 hours, a new survey of the same area will need to be completed).</b></p> <p><b>4.2.3. Nest protection (including setback buffers) must be tailored to the active species, and alert and flush disturbance thresholds, as determined by a qualified individual.</b></p> <p><b>4.2.4. Activity and/or personnel restrictions must be applied within species-specific setbacks.</b></p> <p><b>4.2.5. Annual reporting that demonstrates compliance with conditions during the defined reporting period.</b></p>
Condition 4.3	The Proponent shall establish and delineate, as determined by and under the direction of a qualified individual, setback distances around the nest(s) and residence(s) whose presence or likely presence is determined pursuant to condition 4.2,	The Proponent shall establish and delineate, as determined by a qualified individual, <b>species-specific</b> setback distances around the nest(s) and residence(s) whose presence or likely presence is determined pursuant to condition 4.2, within which that activity

	<p>within which that activity shall not occur while those nests are protected under the <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994</i> and its regulations or the <i>Species at Risk Act</i>, or both. When establishing setback distances, the Proponent shall take into account Environment and Climate Change Canada’s <i>Guidelines to avoid harm to migratory birds</i>.</p>	<p>shall not occur while those nests are protected under the <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994</i>, and its regulations or the <i>Species at Risk Act</i>, or both. When establishing setback distances, the Proponent shall take into account <b>the recommendations of the qualified personnel (pursuant to condition 4.2) and Environment and Climate Change Canada’s Guidelines to avoid harm to migratory birds. When establishing species sensitivities, the Proponent and qualified personnel shall take into account the provincial <i>Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act</i> Species Schedules, and year-round protections afforded to species listed under the <i>Migratory Bird Regulations</i>.</b></p>
<p>Condition 4.5</p>	<p>The Proponent shall take all reasonable measures to prevent migratory birds from accessing sources of water that exceed the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment’s <i>Canadian Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life</i>. Should migratory birds attempt to access these sources of water, the Proponent shall implement deterrents, while taking into account Environment and Climate Change Canada’s <i>Guide for Developing Beneficial Management Practices for Migratory Bird Conservation</i>.</p>	<p><b>The Proponent shall develop, implement, and maintain an adaptive management and corrective action plan for all deterrent systems employed in contact water areas. The objective of the plan is to minimize wildlife (especially waterfowl) mortality and acclimation by facilitating the rapid deployment of backup deterrents, exclusion measures, targeted vegetation removal, and predator decoys. The plan must include the following provisions (at minimum):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>5.1. Ways to prevent acclimation – the Proponent must ensure a variety of deterrent methods are readily available and rotated strategically throughout the open water season.</b></li> <li><b>5.2. Corrective actions triggered by monitoring – the Proponent must define specific action thresholds. If monitoring results indicate increased waterfowl usage or deterrents lose effectiveness, adaptive management actions must immediately</b></li> </ol>

		<p>be implemented by the Proponent per pre-determined adaptive management actions.</p> <p>5.3. Assessment on a case-by-case basis – the Proponent must continuously assess wildlife presence in contact water areas. Any notable increases in wildlife presence shall trigger a review on a case-by-case basis to mandate continuous, active mitigation measures or increased surveillance/monitoring.</p> <p>5.4. Annual Compliance Reporting – The Proponent must submit an annual report demonstrating compliance with conditions during the defined reporting period, including logs of deterrent usage, monitoring, data and corrective actions taken.</p> <p>5.5. Annual (at minimum) mortality searches will be completed along all Project components during appropriate seasons, supplemented by incidental information from routine inspections or monitoring of other components.</p>
Proposed Additional Condition 4.6	N/A	<p>The Proponent shall develop and implement a follow-up program designed to quantify and understand regional population-level impacts on migratory birds to (a) be executed throughout the duration of the Project, and (b) specifically address current data gaps in avian displacement and monitor, track, and analyze pathogen dynamics within local and regional bird populations.</p> <p>The Proponent must conduct supplemental targeted assessments and field surveys to (a) target avian species at risk, including but not limited to species listed under the Species at Risk Public Registry, (b) identify and monitor species of traditional or cultural importance to locally affected First Nations</p>

		<p>communities, and (c) integrate western scientific tracking and monitoring methodologies with Indigenous Traditional Knowledge.</p> <p>The Proponent must formalize a commitment to ongoing collaboration and meaningful engagement with local First Nations and applicable regulatory bodies. The engagement must focus on (a) co-development of targeted reclamation and rehabilitation activities that specifically benefit migratory birds and other culturally significant wildlife, and (b) designing the reclamation process to align with traditional end land uses and needs of locally affected First Nations and current regulatory requirements.</p> <p>4.6.1. The Proponent must complete an expanded threat and cumulative effects assessment prior to construction. The assessment would evaluate how site operations (including haul roads) and regional infrastructure (such as transmission lines and highway realignments) contribute to bird mortality risks, aligning with <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> guidance and submitted to regulatory authorities and potentially affected First Nations.</p> <p>4.6.2. The Proponent must co-develop management thresholds and triggers with First Nations partners to guide adaptive management actions, including (but not limited to) vegetation management and the deployment of wildlife deterrents around contact water ponds. Trigger thresholds and subsequent adaptive management plans must be finalized in consultation with potentially impacted First Nations communities prior to operations.</p>
--	--	--

		<i>See also modifications to draft condition 5.2 and 3.4.</i>
<b>5 – Health, Social, and Economic Conditions of Indigenous Peoples</b>		
Condition 5.1.5	As part of these measures, the Proponent shall: develop a Worker Code of Conduct that includes expectations and requirements in relation to the measures developed to promote safe, respectful and inclusive conduct in the workplace (including the policies referred to in conditions 5.1.1 and 5.1.2). The Proponent shall submit the Worker Code of Conduct to the Agency prior to construction and describe to the Agency how employees of the Designated Project and contractors associated with the Designated Project will be made aware of the Worker Code of Conduct and will be required to comply with it; and	As part of these measures, the Proponent shall: develop a Worker Code of Conduct that includes expectations and requirements in relation to the measures developed to promote safe, respectful and inclusive conduct in the workplace (including the policies referred to in conditions 5.1.1 and 5.1.2) <b>and provisions addressing employee and contractor conduct occurring outside of the Designated Project site where such conduct may adversely affect Indigenous communities or community members, including procedures for the investigation of alleged incidents by an independent third party, where appropriate.</b> The Proponent shall submit the Worker Code of Conduct to the Agency prior to construction and describe to the Agency how employees of the Designated Project and contractors associated with the Designated Project will be made aware of the Worker Code of Conduct and will be required to comply with it.
Condition 5.1.6	As part of these measures, the Proponent shall: Develop and implement a whistleblower program for employee feedback and communication of concerns.	As part of these measures, the Proponent shall: Develop and implement a whistleblower program for employee feedback and communication of concerns. <b>The whistleblower program will be developed and implemented to be publicly accessible. The Proponent will also ensure local communities can access and are made aware of the program through advertising.</b>
Condition 5.2 ( <b>Proposed Additional sub-condition 5.2.7</b> )	The Proponent shall develop, prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups and relevant authorities, and implement during all phases of the Designated Project, a community	<b>5.2.7. The Proponent must implement mandatory incident reporting for all Project personnel. Employees and contractors must report all incidental bird observations, wildlife</b>

	<p>feedback protocol for receiving and addressing complaints related to the exposure to noise, dust, air quality, water quality, and other community safety concerns generated by the Designated Project. The Proponent shall provide the protocol to the Agency and Indigenous groups prior to construction and make the protocol publicly available online. As part of the protocol, the Proponent shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.2.1. acknowledge receipt of any complaint within 48 hours;</li> <li>5.2.2. identify how a person may provide a complaint, how the Proponent will record and address the complaint received, including ranking and responding to the complaint according to the anticipated level of impacts, and how the Proponent will implement modified or additional mitigation measures(s) and/or follow-up requirement(s) in response to the complaint; and</li> <li>5.2.3. implement, as soon as technically feasible, any modified or additional mitigation measure and/or follow-up requirement that the Proponent deems necessary to respond to the complaint received;</li> <li>5.2.4. inform Indigenous groups of mitigation measures implemented in response to their complaints;</li> <li>5.2.5. develop reports summarizing community feedback and engagement statistics; and</li> <li>5.2.6. share summary reports referred to in condition 5.2.5 with interested Indigenous groups, the Agency and relevant authorities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>occurrences, and wildlife mortalities within the PA during any Project-related activities. All incidental sightings, mortalities, and associated adaptive management measures must be compiled, documented, and submitted in an annual report to federal and provincial authorities.</b></p>
--	---	--

<p>Condition 5.8</p>	<p>The Proponent shall develop, prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups, Health Canada, the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and any relevant authorities, and implement during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Designated Project, a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects from the Designated Project on the health of Indigenous Peoples resulting from changes in fish consumed as country foods. As part of the implementation of the follow-up program, the Proponent shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.8.1. Identify the species of fish consumed as country foods to be monitored;</li> <li>5.8.2. establish thresholds for concentrations of arsenic and methylmercury in fish tissue, in species of fish identified pursuant to condition 5.8.1, in consultation with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks and Health Canada pursuant to condition 2.4.5;</li> <li>5.8.3. monitor concentrations of arsenic and methylmercury in fish tissue, in species identified pursuant to condition 5.8.1 at representative upstream, downstream, and effluent discharge locations in the North Driftwood River and the West Buskegau River; and</li> <li>5.8.4. provide the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks data</li> </ul>	<p>The Proponent shall develop, prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups, Health Canada, the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, and any relevant authorities, and implement during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Designated Project, a follow-up program. The program will exist to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects from the Designated Project on the health of Indigenous Peoples resulting from changes in <del>fish consumed as</del> country foods. As part of the implementation of the follow-up program, the Proponent shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>5.8.1.</b> Identify the species of <del>fish consumed as</del> country foods to be monitored;</li> <li><b>5.8.2.</b> establish thresholds for concentrations of arsenic and methylmercury in <b>country foods tissues</b>, in species of fish, <b>mammals, and vegetation, as</b> identified pursuant to condition 5.8.1, in consultation with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks and Health Canada pursuant to condition 2.4.5;</li> <li><b>5.8.3.</b> monitor concentrations of arsenic and methylmercury <del>in fish tissue</del>, in species identified pursuant to condition 5.8.1 at representative upstream, downstream, and effluent discharge locations in the North Driftwood River and the West Buskegau River; and</li> <li><b>5.8.4.</b> provide the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks data obtained from monitoring referred to in condition 5.8.3.</li> <li><b>5.8.5. Tissue sampling completed pursuant to condition 5.8.2 will include tissue sampling for</b></li> </ul>
----------------------	---	--

	<p>obtained from monitoring referred to in condition 5.8.3.</p>	<p><b>fish, berries, browse and forage vegetation, and mammals consumed by First Nations Peoples</b></p> <p><b>5.8.6. Tissue sample collection referred to in condition 5.8.5 must reflect local methods of collection, preparation, and consumption as outlined in the Government of Canada’s Supplemental Guidance on Human Health Risk Assessment for Country Foods</b></p> <p><b>5.8.7. Sample collection and selection of species retained for consumption shall reflect local patterns of harvesting, to ensure tissue samples mirror local use, provide sufficient data to verify impact assessment assumptions, and align with applicable trigger values and tissue types.</b></p>
--	---	--

**7 – Current Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes of Indigenous Peoples**

<p><b>Condition 7.3</b></p>	<p>The Proponent shall prohibit Designated Project employees and contractors from fishing, hunting, trapping, plant gathering and using off-road vehicles for recreational purposes within the Designated Project area or using the Designated Project area to access surrounding areas for these purposes unless an employee or contractor is provided access by the Proponent for exercising Indigenous rights, to the extent that such access is safe.</p>	<p>The Proponent shall prohibit Designated Project employees and contractors from <b>participating in recreational use, including</b> fishing, hunting, trapping, plant gathering and using off-road vehicles for recreational purposes within the Designated Project area or using the Designated Project area to access surrounding areas for these purposes. <b>This prohibition does not apply to Indigenous employees exercising their Aboriginal or Treaty Rights, provided that such access is safe.</b></p>
<p><b>Condition 7.5 (Proposed additional Condition 7.5.3)</b></p>	<p>7.5 The Proponent shall participate in the development, prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups, of an intergenerational knowledge-transfer activity to mitigate adverse effects of the Designated Project on Indigenous cultural heritage and the current use of lands and resources. The Proponent shall participate in the implementation of the activity and provide a description of the activity to the</p>	<p>7.5 The Proponent shall <del>participate in</del> <b>support communities in</b> the development, prior to construction, of <b>a series of</b> intergenerational knowledge-transfer <b>activities</b> <del>activity</del> to mitigate adverse effects of the Designated Project on Indigenous cultural heritage and the current use of lands and resources. The Proponent shall participate in the implementation of the activity and provide a description of the activity to the</p>

	<p>Agency prior to its implementation. In participating in the development of the activity and in consultation with Indigenous groups, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>7.5.1 determine the preferred format(s) of the knowledge-transfer activity; and</p> <p>7.5.2 describe the roles, responsibilities and resources that the Proponent will provide to support the participation of youth and elders.</p>	<p>Agency prior to its implementation. In participating in the development of the activity and in consultation with Indigenous groups, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>7.5.1 determine the preferred format(s) of the knowledge-transfer activity; and</p> <p>7.5.2 describe the roles, responsibilities and resources that the Proponent will provide to support the participation of youth and elders.</p> <p><b>7.5.3 provide financial and capacity support for the development and implementation of these activities.</b></p>
<p><b>Conditions 7.6 (Proposed Additional Conditions 7.6.4, 7.6.5, and 7.6.6)</b></p>	<p>7.6 The Proponent shall manage, during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Designated Project and in consultation with Indigenous groups, adverse federal effects to vegetation of Indigenous importance. In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>7.6.1 identify plant gathering sites and vegetation of Indigenous importance located within the Designated Project area;</p> <p>7.6.2 develop and implement an erosion and sediment control plan and a vegetation management plan; and</p> <p>7.6.3 develop and implement an invasive species management plan, including equipment cleaning protocols and revegetation measures.</p>	<p>The Proponent shall manage, during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the Designated Project and in consultation with Indigenous groups, adverse federal effects to vegetation of Indigenous importance. In doing so, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>7.6.1 identify plant gathering sites and vegetation of Indigenous importance located within the Designated Project area;</p> <p>7.6.2 develop and implement an erosion and sediment control plan and a vegetation management plan; <b>and. If herbicide use or vegetation clearing is considered for vegetation management during any Project phases, notice shall be provided to potentially affected First Nations with sufficient notice to allow for access and harvesting activities during appropriate seasons.</b></p> <p>7.6.3 develop and implement an invasive species management plan, including equipment cleaning protocols and revegetation measures.</p> <p><b>7.6.4 Account for the loss of plant species, wildlife, and habitat, during all phases of the Project,</b></p>

		<p>including operation and decommissioning, and develop a quantified and measurable offsetting plan with all three Nations;</p> <p><b>7.6.5 Provide capacity for First Nations to assess, quantify, and acknowledge the loss of culturally specific gathering sites as a significant adverse effect of high magnitude;</b></p> <p><b>7.6.6 Work directly with affected First Nations to co-develop mitigation and accommodation measures.</b></p> <p><b>7.6.7 Monitoring is required by management plans pursuant to conditions 7.6.2 and 7.6.3, to enable adaptive or corrective actions if deemed necessary, ensure the rapid detection of threats and concerns, address environmental changes, and maintain long-term ecological integrity.</b></p>
<p><b>Condition 7.7 and 7.8 (Make 7.7 and 7.8 one condition that ensures a robust follow-up program is developed and implemented for all adverse effects on Indigenous use of lands and resources for traditional purposes, and proposed additional Conditions 7.7.3, 7.7.4, 7.7.5, and 7.7.6)</b></p>	<p>7.7 The Proponent shall develop, prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups, and implement during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Designated Project, a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects from the Designated Project on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes related to plant gathering.</p> <p>As part of the follow-up program, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>7.7.1 monitor dustfall at sites identified in condition 7.6.1; and</p> <p>7.7.2 if results of monitoring referred to in condition 7.7.1 indicate that dustfall at any</p>	<p>7.7 The Proponent shall develop prior to construction and in consultation with Indigenous groups, and implement during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Designated Project, a follow-up program. The program will exist to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects from the Designated Project on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes related to plant gathering, <b>hunting, fishing, trapping, and all other rights-based activities</b>. As part of the follow-up program, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>7.7.1 monitor dustfall at sites identified in condition 7.6.1; and</p> <p>7.7.2 if results of monitoring referred to in condition 7.7.1 indicate that dustfall at any of the sites identified in condition 7.6.1 exceed the Ontario</p>

	<p>of the sites identified in condition 7.6.1 exceed the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks' <i>Ambient Air Quality Criteria</i>, notify Indigenous groups, in accordance with the communication plan referred to in condition 7.1.</p> <p>7.8 The Proponent shall develop, prior to operations, and in consultation with Indigenous groups, and implement during operations, a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes of Indigenous peoples caused by Designated Project related hydrological changes. As part of the follow-up program, the Proponent shall:</p> <p>7.8.1 identify wildlife habitat or vegetation used by species of importance for Indigenous peoples; and</p> <p>7.8.2 monitor and verify groundwater levels, surface water levels, and wetland extent of hydrological changes and identify any unanticipated alteration of habitat features that support wildlife habitat or vegetation identified in condition 7.8.1.</p>	<p>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks' <i>Ambient Air Quality Criteria</i>, notify Indigenous groups, in accordance with the communication plan referred to in condition 7.1.</p> <p><b>7.7.3 identify wildlife habitat or vegetation used by species of importance for Indigenous Peoples;</b></p> <p><b>7.7.4 monitor and verify groundwater levels, surface water levels, and wetland extent of hydrological changes and identify any unanticipated alteration of habitat features that support wildlife habitat or vegetation identified in condition 7.7.3.</b></p> <p><b>7.7.5 monitor plant and animal health and abundance of harvested species of cultural importance, monitor impacts of the Project on access to gathering, hunting, fishing, and trapping sites, and ensure the safe consumption of these harvested species.</b></p> <p><b>7.7.6 develop and implement modified or additional mitigation measures if the results from monitoring demonstrate that modified or additional mitigation measures are required to mitigate adverse federal effects to the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes related to plant gathering, hunting, trapping, and fishing from all pathways. This includes potential adverse effects arising from changes in soil quality (e.g., contamination), changes in water quality, loss of or altered access to areas, and changes to the experience of being on the land.</b></p> <p><b>7.7.7 develop and implement an iterative real-time feedback system for surrounding receptors. Apply or implement corrective actions as</b></p>
--	---	--

		<p>required within three calendar days of the receipt of feedback.</p> <p><b>7.7.8 Prepare an annual compliance report for the Project to demonstrate alignment with the conditions. The report must be shared with appropriate regulatory bodies and potentially affected First Nations.</b></p>
<p><b>Proposed Additional Condition 7.9.1</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p><b>The Proponent shall develop and implement a predictive permafrost thaw model for the Project and its local and regional assessment areas. The model shall integrate Indigenous Knowledge and western science, account for Project activities and climate change, and be updated throughout the Project using monitoring data to refine predictions of permafrost degradation, ground instability, and geohazards.</b></p> <p><b>The Proponent shall use the model to update hydrogeological assessments, including changes to groundwater flow, recharge/discharge, and surface-groundwater connectivity resulting from permafrost thaw, and incorporate climate change projections. The Proponent shall integrate model results into cumulative effects analysis and evaluate impacts on the Indigenous Rights of First Nations, including effects on water, landscape stability, and ability to exercise rights, and identify mitigation and accommodation measures developed with affected First Nations.</b></p> <p><b>7.9.1.1 Update hydrogeological and hydrological models annually or as directed, using in-situ monitoring data, and share results with IAAC and First Nations.</b></p>

		<p><b>7.9.1.2 Incorporate updated climate change projections, including extreme weather and changes in seasonal hydrology, into all modelling.</b></p> <p><b>7.9.1.3 Establish conservative worst-case thresholds for maximum water extraction and effluent limits prior to Project commencement.</b></p> <p><b>7.9.1.4 Implement adaptive management measures, including reduction or cessation of water extraction, if monitoring or modelling indicates approach to threshold exceedances.</b></p>
<p><b>Proposed Additional Condition 7.9.2</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p><b>The Proponent must design and implement a comprehensive Wetland Identification and Mapping Program to identify, delineate, and map all interconnected and ecologically or provincially significant wetlands in both the PA, and LSA. Mapping is to occur regardless of current provincial classification, size, or regulatory status.</b></p> <p><b>The Proponent must ensure wetland identification and assessment are conducted in meaningful collaboration with potentially affected First Nations groups. To the extent directed by Indigenous participants, studies must consider Indigenous methodologies, Indigenous guardians programs, and landscape characterization to establish baseline conditions.</b></p> <p><b>The Proponent must integrate Indigenous Traditional Knowledge concurrently with western scientific methods to (a) document the historical, cultural, medicinal, and spiritual significance of identified wetland areas, (b) understand hydrological and ecological interconnections from an Indigenous perspective, and (c) identify traditional land and resource use, or any specific cultural values associated with these ecosystems.</b></p>

		<p>Where potential concerns or adverse effects on culturally or ecologically significant wetlands are identified, the Proponent must (a) proactively consult with potentially affected First Nations to develop targeted, culturally appropriate mitigation measures, and (b) avoidance and mitigation strategies must be developed based on both scientific data and Traditional Knowledge.</p> <p>The Proponent must develop a follow-up and monitoring program in collaboration with potentially impacted First Nations groups. The program will monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures and adapt management actions if unforeseen impacts occur to wetlands or the cultural values they support.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Additional Condition 7.10</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The Proponent shall develop and implement, in collaboration with participating First Nations, a Wetland Offsetting and Monitoring Plan to achieve no net loss of wetland ecological and cultural functions. The Plan shall include: (a) cultural and ecological indicators; (b) performance thresholds, timelines, and corrective actions; and (c) financial assurance sufficient to cover closure, post-closure, and reclamation obligations.</p> <p>Where on-site wetland restoration is unsuccessful or unlikely to achieve objectives, the Proponent shall implement an off-site offsetting plan with compensation ratios that account for restoration risk and time lags, in consultation with participating First Nations.</p> <p>The Proponent shall submit annual rehabilitation and reclamation reports to participating First Nations and regulators, summarizing reclamation progress,</p>

		monitoring results, and adaptive management measures.
Proposed Additional Condition 7.11	N/A	<p>The Proponent shall develop and implement, in collaboration with affected First Nations and regulatory authorities, a Species at Risk Follow-up and Monitoring Program for the life of the Project. The program shall:</p> <p>7.11.1 implement mitigation measures for species at risk and critical habitat, including setbacks, seasonal restrictions, and activity-stop triggers;</p> <p>7.11.2 monitor habitat use, movement corridors, and critical habitat features using scientific and Indigenous Knowledge;</p> <p>7.11.3 monitor habitat alteration, mortality, and predator-prey dynamics, and implement measures to address identified threats;</p> <p>7.11.4 establish an adaptive management framework with disturbance thresholds and corrective actions to address declines in habitat use or increases in mortality;</p> <p>7.11.5 implement a no-net-loss habitat offsetting plan, developed with First Nations, that prioritizes restoration of degraded habitat and accounts for restoration timelines; and</p> <p>7.11.6 establish a First Nations–Proponent advisory subcommittee to oversee program implementation, monitoring, mitigation, offsetting, and adaptive management;</p> <p>7.11.7 establish an adaptive management program that encompasses Project impacts on Indigenous groups, including but not limited to Treaty Rights, biophysical health, and social impacts associated with Project activities.</p>

8 – Indigenous Monitors		
Condition 8.1 (Proposed Additional Condition 8.1.4)	N/A	The Proponent shall clearly demonstrate how information gathered by Indigenous monitors will be incorporated into the Project’s adaptive management framework. This shall include identifying specific decision-making processes, thresholds, or triggers for adapting mitigation measures, and mechanisms for reporting back on how Indigenous monitoring results have influenced management responses.
10 – Accidents and Malfunctions		
Condition 10.1.3	In doing so, the Proponent shall: design, construct and maintain water management structures to accommodate, at a minimum, a 1-in-100-year flood event, based on historical climate data and projected future changes in extreme rainfall;	In doing so, the Proponent shall: design, construct, and maintain water management structures to accommodate, at a minimum, a 1-in-100-year flood event, based on historical climate data and projected future changes in extreme rainfall <b>and periodically review and update design assumptions to reflect the best available climate change projections over the life of the Designated Project.</b>
Proposed additional Condition 10.2.4)	N/A	The accidents and malfunctions prevention and response plan shall include: <b>Indigenous groups’ roles and responsibilities in the implementation, testing, review, and updating of the accidents and malfunctions prevention and response plan.</b>
Condition 10.3	The Proponent shall maintain the accidents and malfunctions response plan referred to in condition 10.2 up to date during the phase to which it pertains. The Proponent shall submit any updated accidents and malfunctions response plan to the Agency and to parties consulted for the development of the plan within 30 days of the plan being updated.	The Proponent shall maintain the accidents and malfunctions response plan referred to in condition 10.2 up to date during the phase to which it pertains. The Proponent shall submit any updated accidents and malfunctions response plan to the Agency and to parties consulted for the development of the plan within 30 days of the plan being updated. <b>The Proponent shall provide a rationale for any substantive changes to the plan and describe how</b>

		<p><b>feedback received from Indigenous groups was considered in the update.</b></p>
<p><b>Proposed Additional Condition 10.4.3.7)</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The written report shall include:  <b>an evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation and response measures implemented following the accident or malfunction, including any lessons learned and required corrective actions.</b></p>

As noted above, Table 2 provides specific review comments related to the Draft IAR, including requests for additional assessment and revisions to the IAR. It also provides context and rationale for the recommended revisions and additions to the Draft Conditions outlined in Table 1.

Table 2. WTC Comment Tracking Table

Comment #	Document Name and Section	Issue	Request
<b>General Comments</b>			
1	Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> .	Generally, the Draft Conditions proposed by the IAAC are overly vague and fail to establish clear, enforceable commitments or actionable measures from the Proponent.	WTC requests that the conditions be revised to include specific obligations and measurable and enforceable actions to ensure accountability and effective implementation. WTC has made specific requests related to the draft conditions in Table 1.
2	Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> .  Draft Impact Assessment Report	WTC notes that the Proponent has not developed a Closure Plan. Nor is there a requirement in the IAR for the Proponent to do so. Further, the Draft IAR (p. 74) states that “progressive rehabilitation of the project would be managed through the mine production closure plan should one be filed under Ontario’s <i>Mining Act</i> .” The use of the word <i>should</i> here indicates that the Proponent has no regulatory obligation to develop and implement a Closure Plan.  This omission is unacceptable and represents a significant deficiency in the assessment, particularly given the scale of the Project and the magnitude and duration of its potential impacts. The absence of a Closure Plan fails to provide any assurance that adverse effects will be appropriately mitigated over the full life cycle of the Project, including post-closure. This is of serious concern considering the Project’s potential	The IAAC should require the Proponent to develop, implement, maintain, and periodically update a Closure and Reclamation Plan for all phases of the Project, including post-closure. The plan should be developed in consultation with potentially affected Indigenous Nations and submitted to IAAC prior to construction.  At a minimum, the plan should identify closure objectives, reclamation measures, long-term monitoring requirements, adaptive management measures, and procedures to address residual adverse effects and unforeseen impacts. The requirement should include regular review and updating of the plan throughout the life of the Project to reflect monitoring results, technological advancements, changes in Project design, and Indigenous input.

to adversely affect our First Nations' rights and interests, both within the project area and across the broader region.

**Fish, Fish Habitat, and Hydrology**

Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 2.1: Fish and Fish Habitat

The draft IAR expresses considerable uncertainty as it relates to the potential impacts to fish and hydrology throughout Section 2.1: Fish and Fish Habitat. The draft IAR states that “dewatering of the open pit would lower groundwater levels and thereby reduce groundwater discharge to surface water features and reduce surface water flows near the open pit.” The draft IAR also states that “it is predicted that for most surface water features, this change would become reversible throughout passive closure; however, the effect would not be completely reversed until the open pit has been filled and is connected to the North Driftwood River and West Buskegau River via spillways, which may not occur until over 100 years after active closure.”

Further, the draft IAR states that “ECCC and NRCan identified a high level of uncertainty in the water quantity modelling which could influence the alteration of fish habitat. Specifically, habitat alteration from groundwater drawdown and changes to water balance may be underestimated for magnitude, geographic extent, and duration for the change.”

These statements are very concerning to WTC as it is clear that the Proponent has not been able to accurately predict the scale to which fish, fish

WTC requests that IAAC include a new draft condition that requires the establishment and implementation of a water quantity follow-up monitoring program to include all waterbodies with the potential to be negatively impacted by the significant groundwater drawdown effects from the creation and pumping of the open pit (see suggested new draft conditions 3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, and 3.5.3 in Table 1).

This new condition should also incorporate long-term follow-up monitoring of water quantity as part of the closure plan to understand how local watersheds respond to changes in hydrology from the Project. This water quantity monitoring program should be co-developed and implemented with input from Indigenous groups, as the repercussions of the changes to hydrology pose direct impacts to rights and interests of WTC member Nations.

		<p>habitat, and hydrology will be impacted by the Project. This also contributes to uncertainty when developing any offsetting plans, as it is not clear to what geographic and temporal extent fish habitat may experience harmful alteration, disruption, or destruction (HADD).</p> <p>Given this high level of uncertainty, WTC is concerned that the potential conditions proposed by IAAC will not be sufficient to adequately protect fish and fish habitat from impacts associated with the Project.</p>	
Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 2.1: Fish and Fish Habitat	<p>The draft IAR references the dewatering of the open pit numerous times throughout Section 2.1, and concludes that this activity will have direct negative impacts on fish and fish habitat. However, given the magnitude of this activity, there is no mention of where the water that will be pumped out of the open pit will be released to.</p> <p>The draft IAR states that this will be managed through a Permit to Take water, but the Proponent must be able to indicate at this stage in the Impact Assessment process where such a sizable amount of water will be released; otherwise, it is impossible to determine what risks or impacts may result from this activity.</p>	<p>WTC requests that the IAAC require the Proponent to disclose details regarding plans for the release of the large amount of water that will need to be pumped out of the open pit throughout the lifetime of the mine.</p> <p>WTC requests that IAAC include a new draft condition that requires the Proponent to monitor the volume and quality of water that is pumped out of the open pit, as well as the location(s) of the release of this water (<b>see suggested new draft condition 3.6 in Table 1</b>).</p> <p>The condition should also require that a qualified environmental professional monitor the release points of this water (whether they go to land or water) to record any potential erosion, sedimentation, or other water quality impacts to aquatic organisms.</p>	
Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 2.1: Fish and Fish Habitat	<p>The draft IAR notes that Lake Sturgeon, a species of Special Concern, are considered to be present within the North Driftwood River and Jocko Creek</p>	<p>WTC requests that potential Condition 3.2 be amended to include language that requires the Proponent to manage effluents that are both</p>	

	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>(in the LSA of the Project) based on Indigenous Knowledge provided during the assessment.</p> <p>DFO advised that the Lake Sturgeon habitat in the LSA is more likely to be feeding habitat for juvenile or adult Lake Sturgeon, rather than more sensitive spawning habitat. While WTC acknowledges that sensitive spawning habitats are critical to protect, the presence of juvenile feeding habitat should not be underestimated, as this also accounts for a critical life stage in the development of the species.</p> <p>Further, if organisms that are consumed by juvenile Lake Sturgeon are at risk of contamination from both controlled and uncontrolled effluent discharge into these waterbodies, it is imperative that monitoring include the collection of benthic invertebrates (prey for many fish species) and fish tissue sampling (to monitor for both acute toxicity to fish as well as for the protection of human health).</p> <p>Potential Condition 3.2 outlines that the Proponent shall manage potential mine effluents, but does not specify whether that only includes controlled effluents, or whether they are required to manage (to the degree possible) the potential sources of uncontrolled effluent, as these pose a direct risk of contamination to fish and fish habitat.</p> <p>Potential Condition 3.4 outlines that the Proponent develop a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and effectiveness of mitigation measures as they relate to changes in</p>	<p>controlled and uncontrolled. With no requirement to attempt to manage uncontrolled sources of effluent, these could be overlooked and result in contamination of groundwater, surface water, fish, and fish habitat <b>(see suggested changes to draft Condition 3.2 in Table 1)</b>.</p> <p>WTC requests that draft Condition 3.4 be amended to include a requirement to mitigate and monitor the release of uncontrolled effluent, such as uncontained runoff and seepage, that would be released into the North Driftwood River (and headwater lakes), West Buskegau River, and Jocko Creek watersheds <b>(see suggested changes to draft Condition 3.4 in Table 1)</b>.</p> <p>With known presence of species at risk (SAR) in the watersheds that will be receiving effluent discharge (both controlled and uncontrolled), it is crucial that water quality and mitigations be closely monitored to ensure that any exceedances or unforeseen impacts can be addressed promptly and through adaptive management.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>surface water quality from sources of seepage, including the tailings management facility, impoundment facility, and ore stockpiles. However, there is no mention of monitoring or mitigations for uncontrolled releases of effluent. ECCC does not agree with the Proponent that the seepage face does not overlap with fish habitat, and thus seepage could constitute a direct deposit into fish habitat.</p> <p>IAAC should require the Proponent to more accurately predict and ultimately confirm where these “uncontrolled” sources of contaminants may enter the natural environment and potentially impact species at risk, as well as human health.</p>	
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report</p> <p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i>.</p>	<p>The draft IAR states that there is an estimated total of 116 ha of fish habitat that will undergo destruction or alteration as a result of the Project, but there is little to no detail provided on how offsetting plans will be developed and to what degree Indigenous communities will be involved in their development.</p> <p>The Proponent proposed a 7.7-km long North Driftwood River Diversion Channel, which can be designed to count towards habitat offsetting, but DFO has advised that there are substantial uncertainties and risks associated with the length of the channel including geotechnical feasibility and degree to which natural design can be achieved. If this diversion channel cannot support fish, then habitat alternatives would need to be established to offset the overall loss of habitat by</p>	<p>WTC requests that potential Condition 3.3 be amended to include a requirement to conduct follow-up monitoring on all fish habitat offsetting projects in order to ensure that new or restored habitats are functioning as intended, and to ensure that there is no net less of habitat function as a result of the Project (<b>see suggested changes to draft Condition 3.3 in Table 1</b>).</p>

		<p>the Project. The draft IAR states that IAAC recommends a follow-up program be implemented to verify the efficacy of offsetting through the creation of the diversion channel, as it represents a sizeable portion of the proposed offsets.</p> <p>Draft Condition 3.3 requires the development and implementation of a follow-up program to determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures implemented to restore and develop fish habitat in the North Driftwood River Diversion Channel. However, there is no requirement within this potential condition to conduct follow-up monitoring of any of the other offsetting measures.</p> <p>While WTC acknowledges that the diversion channel is an important offsetting feature, all other offsetting projects carry the same importance, because if they happen to fail, or do not perform as intended, then there will be a net loss of fish habitat function as a result of the Project.</p>	
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 2.1: Fish and Fish Habitat</p>	<p>The draft IAR states that “construction of the realignment of Highway 655, the new rail spur, water management facilities, the diversion channel and other infrastructure would require crossings over areas frequented by fish. Major crossings such as North Driftwood River and Jocko Creek would have free span structures while minor crossings would use culverts.”</p> <p>WTC is concerned that there is no requirement through the potential conditions for the Proponent to assess fish habitat at each crossing, to</p>	<p>WTC requests that a new potential Condition 3.7 be added to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A requirement for the Proponent to accurately characterize each waterbody crossing for the realignment of Highway 655, the new rail spur, water management facilities, diversion channels, and other infrastructure, so that any crossing structures selected for each site are appropriate and sufficient for the protection of fish and fish habitat. This assessment would</li> </ul>

		<p>determine whether the installation of a culvert will potentially cause HADD and thus require offsetting. Even at major crossings where free span structures will be installed, there is potential for impacts to fish and fish habitat, and as such, the conditions should include a requirement for a qualified environmental professional to oversee, and monitor, the installation of all crossing structures at fish-bearing waterways.</p> <p>WTC also notes that there is no mention within the potential conditions for the proponent to adhere to fish timing windows.</p>	<p>also allow for a more accurate determination of which sites may require offsetting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A requirement for the Proponent to adhere, as best as possible, to fish timing windows to reduce impacts during any in-water works or works near fish-bearing waters.</li> </ul> <p><b>See proposed new Condition 3.7 in Table 1.</b></p>
--	--	---	---

## Wetlands

<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report – Table 1: IAACs conclusions on adverse federal effects; Section 2.3 – Direct or incidental adverse effects</p> <p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i>.</p>	<p>WTC has identified critical information gaps in the draft IAR with respect to wetlands affected by the Project that highlight unmitigated risks to s. 35 rights, food security, and ecological integrity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unassessed permafrost degradation and flow regime changes: The Project area lies in an area of discontinuous permafrost, which is highly sensitive to disturbance. The IAR did not consider the effects of clearing land and altering flow regimes, which can trigger thaw and cause instability and contamination. The fundamental changes in water quality, flow, and wildlife will disrupt traditional harvesting, trapping, and cultural activities.</li> <li>2. Absence of Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) in the assessment: The assessment of effects presented in the draft IAR does not identify the presence of</li> </ol>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addressing the following omissions is necessary to ensure the project aligns with federal requirements and First Nations’ interests:</li> <li>• Unassessed permafrost degradation and flow regime changes: WTC recommends a new draft condition (refer to Table 1, proposed condition 7.9.1) requiring the Proponent to provide a predictive permafrost thaw model and an updated hydrogeological assessment to explicitly account for changes to flow regimes, cumulative effects, and the resulting impacts to First Nations’ rights. <b>Please see proposed additional condition in Table 1.</b></li> <li>• Absence of PSWs in the assessment: WTC recommends a new draft condition (<b>refer to Table 1, proposed condition 7.9.2</b>) that focuses on identifying and mapping interconnected wetlands within both the PA</li> </ul>
---	--	--	---

		<p>PSWs. Relying on a lack of prior evaluation in the immediate area creates a false assumption that these important ecosystems are absent from the broader region. Wetlands are important critical habitats for country foods and medicines, and they sustain biodiversity, and filter water.</p>	<p>and regional study area. Collaborative and/or Indigenous-led field studies and the application of Traditional Knowledge should be applied to understand the cultural significance of these areas, and proactively mitigate potential concerns, regardless of provincial classification.</p>
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report – Table 1: IAACs conclusions on adverse federal effects; Section 2.3 – Direct or incidental adverse effects</p> <p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>Progressive rehabilitation is expected to restore some wetland habitats (as the predominant habitat identified to be lost because of the project). The draft IAR “acknowledges that successful wetland restoration within the PA would be partial at best” (PDF pp. 38-39; draft IAR). A follow-up program would be required to determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures and the success (or required corrective actions) of rehabilitation and reclamation efforts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the IAAC has acknowledged that restoration of wetlands within the PA would be partial at best, and to better align with the draft condition 7.4 (progressive reclamation of temporarily disturbed areas to return physically disturbed areas “to a state as close to baseline conditions as possible or better, as soon after the disturbance as feasible”) WTC recommends a new draft condition (<b>see proposed Additional Condition 7.10 in Table 1</b>) which requires the Proponent to offset wetland habitat function, including (at minimum):</li> <li>Assessment via monitoring and follow-up program (in collaboration with First Nations partners), with a focus on developing and evaluating cultural indicators (i.e., country foods, medicinal plants, habitat for culturally significant species), and collect data on reclamation success and environmental health and/or integrity alongside concurrent western science assessments. Clear thresholds must be defined for ecological indicators, that if not met within an established timeline, will trigger corrective actions. A financial security</li> </ul>

			<p>mechanism will be required for closure and all reclamation efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offsite offsetting and compensation may be an option if wetland restoration is expected to be only partially successful. WTC requests to be further engaged on establishing locations for potential off-site offsetting areas, and higher compensation ratios, that account for risk of restoration failure or time lag associated with establishing like-for-like habitats.</li> <li>• Annual reporting to be prepared and shared with participating First Nations and regulators, regarding ongoing rehabilitation and reclamation progress and measures to improve future closure scenarios.</li> </ul>
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report – Table 1: IAACs conclusions on adverse federal effects; Section 4.2.2 – Effects on the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes by Indigenous Peoples</p> <p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>ECCC and Ontario have expressed uncertainty in the Proponent’s water quantity modeling and have indicated that changes in wildlife habitat may occur to an unknown geographic extent. WTC highlights the acknowledged limitations of baseline investigations, which make it impossible to understand the scope and extent of Project-specific impacts as well as cumulative effects on wildlife and vegetation (including SAR).</p>	<p>To better address the uncertainty in water modelling and its downstream effects on wildlife and vegetation (including SAR), WTC requests (<b>as above; see proposed Additional Condition 7.10, Table 1</b>) the Proponent be required to develop and implement a follow-up program for wetland function that supports Indigenous interests, enables local capacity, and ensures free, prior, and informed consent in the habitat planning and recovery process.</p> <p>Regarding water quantity modelling uncertainty, the new condition should require the Proponent to refine their hydrological models with real-time data, and establish worst-case scenario thresholds for water extraction and effluent limits, accounting for climate change variables, to avoid dewatering and protect the groundwater-surface water interface (<b>see proposed Additional Sub-</b></p>

			<p><b>Conditions under 7.9.1).</b></p> <p>Regarding mitigating the downstream effects on wildlife and vegetation (including SAR), WTC strongly recommends that the Project continue to use the legislation required for the baseline assessments (i.e., now superseded Ontario <i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i>) and oppose any weakening of ecological protections or integrity (please see comments below).</p>
--	--	--	--

### Migratory Birds

<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report - Table 1: IAACs conclusions on adverse federal effects; Section 2.2 – Migratory Birds</p> <p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i>.</p>	<p>The IAAC concludes that the Project will result in both significant residual and cumulative effects on migratory birds, even with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures (provided in Table 5). The existing PA represents relatively undisturbed habitats, and the Project is considered the largest contributor to total cumulative effects in the region (based on geographic extent of habitat removal and time lag to regeneration). Despite this, and because regional changes have been determined to be “not likely,” no offsetting or compensation measures have been proposed, nor follow-up program mandated by draft conditions.</p> <p>There are several avian species at risk (SAR) and species of cultural/traditional importance (including game/sustenance species birds, or culturally-revered species) that have potential to occur in the PA, LSA, and larger RSA.</p> <p>The following anticipated impacts are outstanding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant adverse effects – IAAC has concluded that even with mitigation,</li> </ol>	<p>WTC recommends that the IAAC include a draft condition that incorporates further (follow-up) studies to understand regional population impacts, as current assessments show data gaps in avian displacement and limited research on pathogen dynamics (see Table 1, proposed Additional Condition 4.6). Additional assessments should target avian species of traditional or cultural importance (per Annex 5, Attachment 1), and SAR, throughout the duration of the Project. This condition should also include the commitment for additional collaboration and engagement on targeted reclamation and rehabilitation activities that benefit migratory birds and other wildlife species of traditional importance (i.e., small mammals, fish) to better align with WTC end land uses, and provincial and federal requirements.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>residual and cumulative impacts on migratory birds remain significant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The area contains several SAR and birds of traditional and cultural importance for hunting and sustenance, as well as being included in cultural practice and intergenerational knowledge transmission, that may be impacted by the Project.</li> <li>3. Critical baseline gaps – lack of key information hinders an accurate assessment of migratory birds in the region.</li> <li>4. Lack of compensation or follow-up measures.</li> </ol>	
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>Mortality risks for migratory birds in the PA have not been adequately addressed by the draft conditions. Concerns remain around cumulative impacts of the Project and other associated Project components assessed under separate cover (i.e., transmission line). Further details will be required regarding (at minimum):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring for mortality (e.g., methods, frequency, locations, timing, etc.),</li> <li>2. Use and rotation of various deterrents at contact water areas of the Project (<b>see amendments to Condition 4.5; Table 1</b>),</li> <li>3. Criteria to establish when nesting activities are completed (should features be identified),</li> <li>4. Reporting of mortalities, and</li> <li>5. Notification regarding mortalities for species of traditional/cultural concern.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As detailed in the comment above, WTC recommends updating the draft conditions to include a comprehensive Migratory Bird Follow-Up Program, specifically addressing the following requirements:</li> <li>• Expanded threat and cumulative effects assessment: Further studies should evaluate how site operations (i.e., haul roads) and regional infrastructure (transmission lines, highway realignments) contribute to bird mortality risks (<b>see proposed Additional Condition 4.6, Table 1</b>).</li> <li>• Contaminant monitoring: monitoring and testing of observed avian mortalities (i.e., targeting piscivore SAR, and traditional or cultural use species like bald eagle, observed during routine investigations) for potential contaminant bioaccumulation linked to HADD of fish habitat. Draft condition 3.4 can be</li> </ul>

			<p>updated to reflect this change (<b>see proposed Additional sub-condition 3.4.5, Table 1</b>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mandatory incident reporting: implement mandatory reporting by Project personnel for all incidental bird observations and avian mortalities, and any adaptive management measures implemented at the Project, to be compiled and reported on annually. Draft condition 5.2 can be updated to include mandatory employee reporting for wildlife mortalities and incidental wildlife observations in the PA during any activity related to the Project (<b>see proposed additional sub-condition 5.2.7, Table 1</b>).</li> <li>• Collaborative management thresholds: co-develop thresholds and triggers with First Nations partners to guide adaptive management actions (i.e., vegetation management, wildlife deterrents around contact water ponds) (see proposed additional condition 4.6).</li> </ul>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i>.</p>	<p>Replacing the provincial <i>Endangered Species Act</i> with the <i>Species Conservation Act</i> (SCA), and relying solely on the federal <i>Species at Risk Act</i> (SARA) creates critical vulnerabilities for avian populations, and presents a direct risk to the practice of Indigenous Rights. Further, the lack of First Nations consultation on the new legislation or implementation of same violates constitutional duties of the Crown. Additionally, the Project’s species management remains vague and uncertain.</p> <p>The Project may comply with the provincial <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> (EPA), however, the</p>	<p>WTC recommends that the following be included in the draft conditions to enhance the robustness of follow-up programs requested for migratory birds:</p> <p>4.5.6. Independent studies (<b>as further detailed in proposed updates to Condition 4.2</b>)</p> <p>4.5.7. Supporting regional cumulative effects studies targeting birds (<b>as detailed further in proposed Additional Condition 4.6, Table 1</b>)</p> <p>Due to the current regulatory uncertainty presented by implementing the new legislation, WTC also requests further information regarding whether the Proponent has already consulted the</p>

		<p>online SCA registry allows for broader ecological or habitat-altering developments under less scientific, public, and provincial scrutiny.</p> <p>With the provincial SCA coming into effect (replacing the ESA), the definition of “habitat” for species has narrowed significantly when applied to provincial and Crown lands. The SCA is considered insufficient by WTC to manage federally designated species under SARA. This is based on known jurisdictional gaps and repealed provincial protections for over 100 species (many of which are considered traditionally or culturally important to WTC member Nations).</p>	<p>ECCC with respect to compliance with SARA at the Project.</p> <p>The baseline data gathering, scoping, and assessments for the designated Project, were initiated and completed under the former ESA. As such, WTC asserts that is in the best interests of member Nations that the legislation used to characterize and assess the baseline information (the dismantled ESA) be used to evaluate any changes over time, regardless of the political or ministerial decisions of the Crown. Further, failing to evaluate the cumulative, long-term environmental changes of the Project, especially under the pretense of deregulation, creates risks to the rights and interests of WTC member Nations and their members, from unmitigated ecological degradation, triggering ecological vulnerabilities, and removing industry accountability.</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>Draft condition 4.2 states: “the Proponent shall determine, under the direction of a qualified individual and using non-intrusive methods selected based on habitat type, the presence, or likely presence of migratory bird nest(s) protected under the <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994</i> and its regulations and residences protected under the <i>Species at Risk Act</i> that may be adversely affected by any Designated Project activity prior to initiating the activity.”</p> <p>Disturbance to active nests is in contravention of the MBCA regardless of timing. Inexperienced surveyors should not complete nesting surveys during the General Nesting Period (GNP), as nests</p>	<p>Detectability of migratory birds may change throughout a survey, varying with the type and quality of habitat, density of vegetation growth, and surveyor experience. WTC requests the condition be updated to state: “the Proponent shall determine, <b>by employing</b> a qualified individual and using non-intrusive methods,” per the definitions provided in Attachment 2 (<b>see proposed updates to Condition 4.2; Table 1</b>).</p> <p>Given the extent of the Project footprint to be cleared, or subject to high-intensity mining activities, for any surveys targeting migratory birds during the GNP, the following are also recommended as sub-conditions (<b>see</b></p>

		<p>are well-concealed and birds can be elusive during breeding season. Surveys in complex habitats during the breeding season require more comprehensive surveying than what is proposed in the draft condition (e.g., considers factors such as nest site characteristics [vegetation density and height, camouflage, visual/olfactory cues], bird behaviour [activity, incubation schedule, displays], and survey methods [time of day/year, ground/aerial surveys]). If inexperienced surveyors are completing these complex surveys, this will likely result in nesting species going undetected during the survey period and increases harm to nesting birds. Unqualified surveyors can easily miss inconspicuous species and/or nests, which heightens the risk of accidental nest damage, incidental take, and nest abandonment during critical breeding periods.</p>	<p><b>proposed Additional Conditions 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5; Table 1):</b></p> <p>4.5.1. Nest surveys should be conducted in the weeks prior to and following the GNP to confirm whether active breeding is taking place wherever vegetation/ground disturbance is required (e.g., until there is reasonable assurance that no nesting is occurring).</p> <p>4.5.2. Nest surveys should be considered valid for up to two days prior to disturbance (if completed within the GNP), as some species may initiate egg laying activities in two to three days (i.e., if disturbance does not occur within 48 hours, a new survey of the same area will need to be completed).</p> <p>4.5.3. Nest protection (including setback buffers) should be tailored to the active species, and alert and flush disturbance thresholds, as determined by a qualified individual.</p> <p>4.5.4. Activity and/or personnel restrictions must be applied within species-specific setbacks.</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>Draft condition 4.3 states: “the Proponent shall establish and delineate, as determined by and under the direction of a qualified individual, setback distances around the nest(s) and residence(s) whose presence or likely presence is determined pursuant to condition 4.2, within which that activity shall not occur while those nests are protected under the <i>Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994</i>, and its regulations or the <i>Species at Risk Act</i>, or both. When establishing setback distances, the Proponent shall take into account Environment and Climate Change Canada’s <i>Guidelines to avoid harm to migratory</i></p>	<p>As recommended above, species-specific setback buffers should be applied by a qualified individual to features that are presumed active. <b>See the requested revisions to Condition 4.3 in Table 1.</b></p>

		<p><i>birds.”</i></p> <p>WTC maintain concerns that the draft condition, as written, does not adequately mitigate potential risks to migratory birds.</p>	
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report - Table 1: IAACs conclusions on adverse federal effects; Section 2.2 – Migratory Birds</p> <p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>Draft condition 4.5 states: “the Proponent shall take all reasonable measures to prevent migratory birds from accessing sources of water that exceed the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment’s <i>Canadian Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life</i>. Should migratory birds attempt to access these sources of water, the Proponent shall implement deterrents, while taking into account Environment and Climate Change Canada’s <i>Guide for Developing Beneficial Management Practices for Migratory Bird Conservation</i>.”</p> <p>WTC maintains that the draft condition is insufficient, as written, to fully address or mitigate concerns related to contact surface water interactions with waterfowl at the Project.</p>	<p>WTC requests that draft condition 4.5 be updated to include an adaptive management and corrective action (strategic management) plan for all deterrent systems employed by the Project in contact water areas (<b>see amendments to Condition 4.5; Table 1</b>). This ensures that when wildlife acclimates to a method, or method effectiveness drops, the Proponent can rapidly deploy backup deterrents, exclusion measures, targeted vegetation removal, or predator decoys.</p> <p>The plan must include the following (at minimum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ways to prevent acclimation: ensuring a variety of deterrent methods are readily available and rotated throughout the open-water season strategically</li> <li>• Require corrective actions: adaptive management actions to be implemented if monitoring results indicate increased waterfowl usage or deterrents lose effectiveness</li> <li>• Assessment on a case-by-case basis: to trigger continuous, active mitigation measures or increased monitoring whenever wildlife presence in contact water areas increase</li> <li>• Annual reporting requirements that demonstrate compliance with conditions during the defined reporting period</li> </ul>

**Other wildlife and wildlife habitat**

<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>As mentioned above, there is existing uncertainty in the baseline characterization, and a lack of follow-up programs proposed, for terrestrial or semi-aquatic wildlife species of traditional or cultural concern (including SAR, as discussed more in the comments below). The mortality risk to non-avian wildlife has similarly not been adequately addressed under the draft conditions, as written.</p>	<p>WTC provides the following recommendations to address existing concerns with the proposed conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mortality testing: update draft condition 3.4 to include incidental mortality testing of semi-aquatic mammal piscivores listed as traditional/cultural use species (i.e., otter) (<b>see proposed additional sub-condition 3.4.5; Table 1</b>).</li> <li>• Mandatory reporting: update draft condition 5.2 to require Project personnel to immediately report any wildlife mortalities (<b>see proposed additional sub-condition 5.2.7, Table 1</b>).</li> <li>• Mortality searches: complete annual mortality searches along all Project components (e.g., transmission line, footprint, etc.), during appropriate seasons, supplemented by incidental information from routine inspections or monitoring for other Project components (<b>see proposed additional sub-condition 4.5.5; Table 1</b>).</li> <li>• Indigenous consultation – communicate follow-up program results to Indigenous groups, using targeted communication procedures designed in consultation with them, as outlined in other draft conditions (<b>see modifications to draft Condition 4.5, Table 1</b>).</li> </ul>
<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>The Project does not adequately meet multi-species offsetting needs nor the associated goals of provincial and federal jurisdictions (i.e., DFO’s Framework to Identify Fish Habitat Restoration Priorities) that require holistic ecosystem recovery</p>	<p>WTC requests that draft condition 3.3 be updated to include similar monitoring for terrestrial and semi-aquatic wildlife (e.g., amphibians, mammals, waterfowl) that would feasibly use the restored habitat in North Driftwood River Diversion Channel</p>

		<p>rather than isolated, single-species management. Without targeted pre- and post-construction monitoring for terrestrial and aquatic SAR, the Proponent risks violating SARA.</p>	<p>offset, particularly targeting species of traditional/cultural importance and SAR. This would better align with multi-species offsetting needs and provincial and federal guidance/requirements (<b>see proposed additional sub-condition 3.3.3; Table 1</b>).</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i>.</p>	<p>The baseline assessment did not identify the presence of caribou, yet the location is considered designated critical habitat for a critically endangered subpopulation (Kesagami herd). Similar projects also overlap designated critical habitat for the Kesagami herd, and require an Overall Benefit Permit and/or additional offsetting measures to encourage the recovery of this subpopulation, yet there is no follow-up monitoring or management program required under the proposed conditions for the proposed Project.</p> <p>The proposed Project and draft conditions do not currently align with legislative compliance, nor address long-term impacts on the critically endangered Kesagami herd.</p> <p>The absence of caribou observed in the assessment does not diminish the area’s ecological importance to the species (i.e., large range/migration, various critical habitats). The lack of follow-up monitoring or management for this subpopulation is a critical oversight, given the herd’s critically endangered status.</p>	<p>WTC recommends including a new draft condition for a follow-up program targeting caribou throughout the duration of the project (<b>see proposed additional condition 7.11, Table 1</b>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor habitat and ecology – confirm caribou habitat utilization, movement corridors, and calving grounds in proximity to the proposed Project.</li> <li>• Track cumulative effects and predators – monitor all natural and human-caused habitat alterations, local mortality rates near the Project boundary, and predator dynamics.</li> <li>• Adaptive management – co-develop targeted restoration efforts and clear disturbance thresholds for immediate corrective actions with WTC, if required.</li> <li>• Strict mitigation measures for SAR with critical habitat overlapping the PA.</li> <li>• Environmental advisory subcommittee to be developed and co-led by partnering First Nations (i.e., to establish the follow-up program, collaboration on enforcement of mandatory setbacks, seasonal construction restrictions, trigger thresholds to halt or pause activities).</li> </ul> <p>Because the location falls within designated critical habitat for the Kesagami herd, the Project must also implement a robust offsetting plan designed</p>

			for no net loss, prioritizing the restoration of degraded, historical habitat outside the Project footprint at an appropriate ratio (including weighting for the time lapse required for successful restoration of sensitive/at risk species), co-developed with First Nations.
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report - Table 1: IAACs conclusions on adverse federal effects; Section 5 – Extent to which the project effects contribute to Canada’s environmental obligations</p> <p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i>,</p>	<p>WTC highlights the IAAC conclusions from Section 5 (Attachment 1), that the Project is likely to result in adverse federal effects on fish, migratory birds, certain wetlands, and species of importance for Indigenous Peoples respectively. Furthermore, the Project may adversely affect habitat for other birds, bats, turtles, and insects listed as species at risk.</p> <p>WTC maintains concerns that the proposed Project overlaps designated critical habitat for caribou, and also appears to overlap critical habitat for little brown myotis, tri-coloured bat, and northern myotis; however, there have been no follow-up programs, draft conditions, or specific mitigation measures presented by the Proponent or IAAC that provide confidence to WTC and member Nations that these traditionally and culturally important species will be afforded appropriate protections throughout the duration of the Project.</p>	<p>The proposed Project and draft conditions do not currently align with legislative compliance, nor address long-term impacts/recovery for several endangered species.</p> <p>As indicated in the comment above, WTC recommends that a follow-up program and mandatory offsetting be included in the draft conditions (<b>see proposed Additional Condition 7.11, Table 1</b>), targeting species at risk with designated critical habitat overlapping the RSA (e.g., caribou, bats).</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>Draft condition 5.8 identifies the requirement for a follow-up program to verify the accuracy of the impact assessment and determine the effectiveness of mitigation measures with respect to adverse federal effects from the Project on the health of Indigenous Peoples resulting from changes in fish consumed as country foods.</p>	<p>WTC recommends that draft condition 5.8 be expanded to include tissue sampling for berries and mammals consumed by Indigenous Peoples (<b>see proposed updates to Condition 5.8, Table 1</b>). As per the Government of Canada’s Supplemental Guidance on Human Health Risk Assessment for Country Foods, tissue sample collection should reflect local methods of collection, preparation,</p>

		<p>WTC maintains concerns that country foods consumed by Indigenous Peoples also include vegetation and wildlife (including game birds, furbearers, etc.).</p> <p>It is important that different culturally relevant plants and different tissue types (corresponding to what local First Nations are consuming) are sampled and analyzed to compare to relevant trigger levels and verify the assumptions made in the assessment. Also, certain types of vegetation and plant parts may preferentially accumulate contaminants.</p>	<p>and consumption, because food harvesting practices, preservation, treatment, and/or cooking methods can change the concentration and speciation of contaminants of concern. Sample collection should reflect the local patterns of harvesting for species retained for consumption, so that tissue samples reflect local use and provide sufficient data to verify the assumptions in the impact assessment. It is also recommended that browse and forage vegetation are sampled in addition to berries, to ensure that data collection aligns with trigger values and tissue types considered.</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i></p>	<p>Draft condition 7 indicates the proposed requirements to maintain/improve the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes of Indigenous Peoples.</p> <p>There are improvements to the current draft conditions that can be made to increase the rigour and robustness of these requirements.</p>	<p>WTC recommends incorporating the following into draft condition 7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetation management (<b>see proposed updates to Condition 7.6.2, Table 1</b>): for example, information regarding herbicide applications (if any), proposed access limitations, additional clearing, etc., and notifications for same; ensuring notice is sufficient to allow for access and harvesting during appropriate seasons identified by partnering First Nations</li> <li>• Monitoring: required by management plans to enable adaptive or corrective actions, ensure the rapid detection of threats/concerns, address environmental changes, and maintain long-term ecological integrity (<b>see proposed additional sub-condition 7.6.7; Table 1</b>)</li> <li>• Complaint system: an iterative process providing real-time feedback from surrounding receptors, and corrective actions implemented by the Proponent; annual reporting for same</li> </ul>

			<p><b>(see proposed additional sub-condition 7.7.7; Table 1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progressive and final reclamation: should consider target species and/or groups of species as a target for restoration (per the Proponent’s requirements to reclaim habitats “as close to baseline conditions as possible or better,” better align with provincial/federal requirements, and comments above) <b>(see proposed additional condition 7.10; Table 1)</b></li> <li>• Annual reporting that demonstrates compliance with conditions during the defined reporting period <b>(see proposed additional sub-condition 7.7.8; Table 1)</b></li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

### Accidents and Malfunctions

	Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 3 Malfunctions and Accidents	The report repeatedly characterizes dam failures, water management failures, stockpile failures, and major spills as "unlikely," relying on qualitative likelihood statements without providing sufficient information on probability estimates, failure modes analysis, climate uncertainty, or independent review findings to support those conclusions.	<p>WTC recommends incorporating the following information to support the conclusion around likelihood of accidents and malfunctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual probability of failure</li> <li>• Underpinning assumptions that support annual probability estimates</li> <li>• How probabilities may change under future climate and extreme weather scenarios</li> </ul>
	Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 3- Malfunctions and Accidents- Water Management facility failure leading to release of untreated contact water.	The report states that water management structures are designed to accommodate, at minimum, a 1-in-100-year flood event. It could be argued that a 1:100 standard is increasingly outdated for major mining infrastructure. Given the increasing frequency and intensity of extreme precipitation events in Northern Ontario, the rationale for using a 1:100-year design event should be justified. Consideration should be given to more conservative design standards for critical	<p>WTC would like to ensure the following points are considered within potential failures of water management structures as part of the IAR before a decision on the Project is made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of the climate scenario used.</li> <li>• Was probable maximum precipitation evaluated?</li> <li>• Consideration regarding potential failures if multiple climate-driven failures occur simultaneously?</li> </ul>

		infrastructure such as tailings and water management facilities.	
	Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 3- Malfunctions and Accidents- Table 6: Summary of IAAC's recommended mitigation measures and follow-up program for implementation by the proponent pertaining to malfunctions and accidents	<p>The report repeatedly says that Indigenous communities will be informed, will receive notifications, and will be consulted on communications.</p> <p>This limits the involvement of Indigenous communities to passive observation and the receiving of information post accident or malfunction. The IAR should be revised to ensure Indigenous involvement in malfunctions and accidents includes proactive planning and decision making including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation in emergency response planning;</li> <li>• Indigenous monitoring roles;</li> <li>• Indigenous-led inspections;</li> <li>• Indigenous access to real-time monitoring data; and</li> <li>• participation in dam safety reviews.</li> </ul>	WTC emphasizes that Indigenous Nations should be involved in the development, implementation, testing, and periodic review of malfunction and accident response plans, rather than solely receiving notifications following incidents.
	Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 3- Malfunctions and Accidents- Table 6: Summary of IAAC's recommended mitigation measures and follow-up program for implementation by the Proponent pertaining	The assessment relies heavily on future plans, programs, and response measures that have not yet been developed or made available for review. As a result, it is difficult to evaluate whether proposed mitigation measures would be effective in preventing or responding to malfunctions and accidents. Deferring key mitigation details to future planning and regulatory processes limits the ability of participants to meaningfully assess the	The IAAC should ensure that key components of emergency response, accident management, monitoring, and communication plans are developed and reviewed prior to Project approval, or that decision statement conditions clearly establish minimum requirements, Indigenous participation mechanisms, performance objectives, and adaptive management triggers.

	<p>to malfunctions and accidents.</p>	<p>effectiveness of the Project's mitigation strategy during the impact assessment process.</p> <p>The assessment appears to assume that future planning processes will adequately address identified risks, but provides limited information regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the specific standards that these plans must meet;</li> <li>• how Indigenous Nations would participate in their development and implementation;</li> <li>• what performance criteria would be used to evaluate effectiveness;</li> <li>• how compliance would be monitored and enforced; and</li> <li>• what corrective actions would occur if mitigation measures prove ineffective.</li> </ul>	
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 3- Malfunctions and Accidents- Table 6: Summary of IAAC's recommended mitigation measures and follow-up program for implementation by the Proponent pertaining to malfunctions and accidents.</p>	<p>The assessment relies heavily on future provincial permitting and regulatory processes to address key uncertainties related to infrastructure design, dam safety, water management, and emergency response. While provincial oversight is important, it is unclear how adverse federal effects can be effectively mitigated based on the information currently available in the assessment.</p>	<p>The impact assessment should demonstrate, within the federal assessment record itself, that adverse federal effects can be effectively mitigated. References to future provincial permitting and regulatory oversight should supplement, rather than replace, a detailed evaluation of mitigation effectiveness and residual risk. Where the assessment relies on future provincial approvals, IAAC should clearly explain how federal conclusions can be reached despite outstanding design details and regulatory decisions.</p>

Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Interests			
	Draft Impact Assessment Report – Executive Summary	The Agency states that the Project is likely to have positive economic impacts for Indigenous Peoples. This is an over generalization of the economic possibilities for the Project in regard to Indigenous Peoples. Many individuals are not in work ready a stage and benefits will not be evenly distributed among Indigenous Peoples. For some, the negative impacts of the Project will out weight any potential economic benefits.	WTC request the Agency clarify the language in Table 2 of the executive summary to the Project is likely to have positive economic impacts <b>on specific sub-groups</b> of Indigenous Peoples. This differentiates between the gap of benefits for Indigenous peoples being different for marginalized people than for economically stable and work ready peoples.
	Draft Impact Assessment Report – Section 4.2.1 Effects on the physical and cultural heritage and structures, sites, or things of historical, archaeological, paleontological, or architectural significance to Indigenous Peoples	<p>In Section 4.2.1 of the Draft IAR, IAAC has determined the Project's residual adverse effects on physical and cultural heritage are likely to be significant to a low extent, and that the cumulative effects of the Project combined with other physical activities, are likely to be significant to a low to moderate extent. This classification does not take into account severity of the loss of cultural continuity.</p> <p>There are seven other mineral development sites in the area, the Project is being developed on a greenfield site and has a vast footprint that will be forever altered and unusable for our people, meaning many sites of cultural significance and value will be irreversibly lost. Without access to culturally significant sites, knowledge will not be past down through generations, hindering cultural continuity.</p>	WTC request the Agency revisit and revise its classification of the residual adverse effects and the residual cumulative effects on the physical and cultural heritage of Indigenous Peoples to significant to a moderate extent. The ongoing resource development in the area and irreversible loss of culturally significant sites and longer-term effects on cultural continuity cannot be understated.
	Draft Impact Assessment Report – Section 4.2.1 Effects on the physical and cultural heritage and structures, sites,	Keepers of the Circle has not entered into a formalized partnership with CNC, and their programs will not address the cumulative loss a project of this magnitude will have on our	WTC requests the Agency remove the example of the Keepers of the Circle's On-the-Land Learning Program.

	<p>or things of historical, archaeological, paleontological, or architectural significance to Indigenous Peoples</p>	<p>territories and our land use. It is not a reasonable assumption that Keepers of the Circle’s On-the-Land Learning Program is a feasible option to preserve culturally significant sites and address larger cumulative effects as the center is not in close proximity to the Project and impacted nations may not have easy access to on the land programs.</p>	
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report – Section 4.3.2 Impacts on the exercise of Section 35 rights</p>	<p>In Section 4.3.2 of the Draft IAR, IAAC has determined that most of the impacts to Flying Post, Mattagami, and Matachewan First Nations’ section 35 rights will be low severity. This includes impacts to hunting, fishing, gathering, cultural continuity, and governance and stewardship.</p> <p>The IAAC’s methodology for determining significance and severity in the Draft IAR is, in our opinion, flawed. The conclusion that most impacts on our Mattagami, Flying Post, and Matachewan First Nations’ rights are of low severity appears to rely heavily on the assumption that recommended mitigation measures will be effective. However, the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft Conditions are overly vague, lack enforceability, and are not sufficiently detailed to be actionable. In the absence of clear, binding measures, it is unclear how the IAAC has reached its conclusions regarding impact severity.</p>	<p>We request that the IAAC revisit and revise its severity determinations in meaningful collaboration with WTC, ensuring that they are grounded in concrete, enforceable mitigation measures and reflect our knowledge, concerns, and priorities.</p>
	<p>Draft Impact Assessment Report – Section 4.3.2 Impacts on the exercise of Section 35 rights</p>	<p>On p. 126 of the Draft IAR, IAAC states its process for seeking free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) from Indigenous communities. IAAC concludes that any statement received on consent, non-objection, or non-consent to the Project will be used to <i>inform</i> the minister’s decision-making.</p>	<p>IAAC should revise its approach to FPIC to align with the standard set out in UNDRIP as well as Actions 66, 67, and 68 in Canada’s <i>United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act</i> Action Plan. Specifically, the IAAC should ensure that the consent or non-consent of</p>

		<p>WTC holds a different understanding of FPIC as it is defined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). UNDRIP requires States (the Crown) to obtain FPIC <i>prior</i> to the approval of any project impacting their rights and Traditional Territories. In our view, FPIC is not limited to informing decision-making outcomes; rather, consent or the absence of consent must play a determinative role in the decision itself. This includes advancing Indigenous governance and self-determination through meaningful shared decision-making.</p>	<p>affected Indigenous Nations plays a determinative role in Project decision-making, rather than serving solely as an input to be considered. This approach must support and advance Indigenous governance and self-determination, including through the establishment of shared decision-making mechanisms with affected Nations prior to any project approval.</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> – Section 2 General Conditions</p>	<p>Draft Conditions 2.14 and 2.15 relate to the potential change of Proponent for the Project. However, these only set conditions for the current Proponent (CNC) to notify Indigenous groups and the IAAC about this change. There is no condition set for the new Proponent to comply with the Project approval conditions, nor to continue upholding any engagements CNC has made towards Indigenous groups, including WTC.</p>	<p>As CNC is a junior mining company and Proponent changes in Proponent ownership are common in mining projects, WTC requests that a condition be included under Change of Proponent requiring any new Proponent to comply with all approval conditions and to uphold existing commitments and engagement obligations the current Proponent has made to Indigenous groups.</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> – Section 7 Current use of lands and resources</p>	<p>Draft Condition 7.3 states that the Proponent shall prohibit all employees and contractors from practising activities such as fishing, hunting, trapping, and gathering within the Project area, unless they are provided access by the Proponent for exercising Indigenous Rights.</p> <p>WTC notes two problems with this condition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WTC understands that there is a need for the Proponent to be aware of the activities happening within the Designated Project</li> </ol>	<p>Based on the issues raised, WTC has requested the following changes to the Draft Conditions in Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The language in Condition 7.3 must be revised to reflect WTC members’ inherent rights to access our Traditional Territory. Discretion of access cannot be given by the Proponent, unless there is a safety issue, which the Proponent must adequately justify.</li> </ul>

		<p>area due to safety concerns. WTC also agrees that all activities outside of section 35 or Treaty Rights should be prohibited in the Project area. Our First Nation members should not be required to seek permission to exercise their Aboriginal and Treaty Rights within our Traditional Territory. As currently drafted, the condition gives the Proponent discretion to determine who may access the Project area to exercise these rights. This authority creates a risk of discriminatory decision-making and may impede our members' ability to freely exercise their rights.</p> <p>2. This condition lacks any enforcement or penalty mechanism, making it unclear how it would be implemented or upheld in practice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language must be added to Condition 7.3 to ensure the Proponent commits to enforcing this condition.</li> </ul>
Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> – Section 7 Current use of lands and resources	Draft Condition 7.5 requires CNC to participate in an intergenerational knowledge-transfer activity prior to construction to “mitigate adverse effects of the Designated Project on Indigenous cultural heritage and the current use of lands and resources.” While we acknowledge that such activity, particularly when developed and led by community Knowledge Holders, can support the transmission of intergenerational knowledge, a one-time activity is insufficient to meaningfully mitigate the impacts of the Project on our First Nations’ rights to use and occupy their traditional lands.	WTC requests that the Proponent commit to facilitating recurring intergenerational knowledge transfer activities throughout the Project lifecycle, where and if appropriate.	Further, for these activities to be beneficial, they must be developed by the communities themselves and not solely in consultation with communities. The Proponent should facilitate these by providing financial and capacity support.
Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact</i>	Draft Conditions 7.6.1 and 7.8.1 require the Proponent to identify plant gathering sites, wildlife	In accordance with our letter to IAAC dated May 27, 2026, in response to the Designated	

<p><i>Assessment Act</i> – Section 7 Current use of lands and resources</p>	<p>habitat, and species of Indigenous importance within the PA. This first step is important, however, there is no follow-up condition that requires the Proponent to develop and implement specific mitigation measures to address the impacts of the Project on these sites and plant species. Without clear obligations to implement mitigation measures co-developed with affected First Nations, these conditions are largely symbolic, lack enforceable action, and do not provide accommodation.</p> <p>Further, the Conditions do not specify how these areas and populations will be identified.</p>	<p>Project Impact Statement, please see WTC requests for expanded language in Draft Condition 7.6.1 in Table 1 above. The requested changes are intended to provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Account for the loss of plant species, wildlife, and habitat, during all phases of the Project, including operation and decommissioning, and develop a quantified and measurable offsetting plan with all three Nations;</li> <li>• Assess, quantify, and acknowledge the loss of culturally specific gathering sites as a significant adverse effects of high magnitude;</li> <li>• Work directly with affected First Nations to co-develop mitigation and accommodation measures.</li> </ul>
<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> – Section 7 Current use of lands and resources</p>	<p>The only requirements for follow-up programs (Draft Conditions 7.7 and 7.8) pertain to monitoring dustfall, notifying Indigenous groups of elevated dust levels, monitoring hydrological changes, and identifying harvesting areas. The limited scope of this follow-up program is inadequate and not only fails to require monitoring for all potential effects pathways, but also fails to require any corresponding mitigation, adaptive management, or protection measures. While dust monitoring may help identify one potential pathway of impact, it does not address the broader range of effects the Project may have on plant gathering sites, including habitat disturbance, soil compaction, vegetation removal, contamination pathways beyond dust deposition, or reduced access to harvesting areas.</p>	<p>WTC requests that a comprehensive monitoring and follow-up program be developed for the impacts of the Project on Indigenous plant gathering sites and species of cultural importance. This program must include, but not be limited to, monitoring plant health and abundance of species of cultural importance, monitoring impacts of the project on access of gathering sites and important plant species, and ensuring the safe consumption of these plants.</p> <p>Requested changes and additions to Condition 7.7 in Table 1 reflect the recommendations made in the Draft IAR that did not get included in the Draft conditions.</p> <p>Note that these changes have been requested to expand the scope of the monitoring and follow-up programs, as they are too narrow in scope as</p>

		<p>Further, notification of elevated dust levels alone does not prevent or reduce harm, it merely informs affected communities after impacts may already be occurring. There is no requirement for the Proponent to take corrective action, adjust operations, or incorporate Indigenous Knowledge to protect plant species of cultural importance.</p>	<p>currently presented in the Draft Conditions. The Proponent should be required to mitigate the adverse effects of the Project on rights-based harvesting activities from all relevant pathways, not solely those related to air quality. This includes potential adverse effects arising from changes in soil quality (e.g., contamination), changes in water quality, loss of or altered access to areas, and changes to the experience of being on the land.</p>
	<p>Potential conditions established under section 64 of the <i>Impact Assessment Act</i> – Section 8 Indigenous Monitors</p>	<p>Draft Condition 8.1 requires the Proponent to hire Indigenous Monitors to participate in the implementation of follow-up programs. However, as part of this Draft condition, IAAC has only identified requirements related to the selection, involvement, and support of Indigenous Monitors. While it is important to establish these requirements, this Draft Condition lacks specific and measurable actions.</p> <p>Further, and more importantly, IAAC has not specified how the information gathered by Indigenous Monitors will be used by the Proponent to inform adaptive management of the Project. Without an explicit requirement for the Proponent to demonstrate how the data and findings from Indigenous monitoring will be meaningfully integrated into its adaptive management plan, this Draft Condition risks yielding no actionable outcomes. This, in turn, risks imposing an unnecessary burden on Indigenous Monitors to collect information that may not influence Project decisions or lead to meaningful improvements in environmental management.</p>	<p>Under Draft Condition 8.1, there must be a sub-condition added to reflect the Proponent’s commitment to integrating the knowledge gathered by Indigenous Monitors into their adaptive management. <b>Please refer to Table 1 for the requested addition.</b></p>

	Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 5 Extent to which project effects contribute to Canada's environmental obligations	Given the Project's adverse effects on a wide variety of species and lack of contribution to Canada's environmental obligations, the Proponent should have further obligations to work towards environmental and biodiversity targets. The Project's footprint is largely irreversible, resulting in a loss of habitat for culturally important species, and species at risk that cannot be mitigated.	WTC requests that a condition of approval be included for the Proponent to contribute to Canada's ability to meet its environmental obligations, including specific research support, off-setting measures, and consultation with Indigenous communities to support biodiversity and avoid further environmental harm. <b>See Table 1 for specific requested Condition.</b>
	Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 7: Extent to which project effects contribute to sustainability	Many of the potential benefits presented in the draft report to well-being of present and future generations contain uncertainty, especially with the nickel market fluctuations and potential future projects such as the nickel refinery and stainless steel and alloy production plan. Following, the Project's economic benefits for Indigenous communities and the region, and Proponent-led measures and collaboration with municipalities on planning initiatives will not offset the adverse effects on WTC Nations to an extent that justifies a result in an overall positive contribution to sustainably. The large loss of land and related impacts on our abilities to harvest, practice traditions, knowledge transfer, and cultural continuity will be substantial and will span multiple generations.	Economic benefits will not make up for the negative effects brought on by the Project. The costs of well-being of present and future generations from the loss of land and impacts to our section 35 rights and traditional practices cannot be understated.  We request that the Agency reconsider their assessment of the Project's ability to contribute to sustainability and take into account the unpredictability that exists for the Project and the irreversibility of its effects.
	Draft Impact Assessment Report - Section 7: Extent to which project effects contribute to sustainability	The likely effects of the Project should not be listed as contributing to Canada's sustainability. Canada's role in mineral production should be divorced from language such as sustainability as mining for non-renewable resources Canada is a state of ecological decline and degradation. The Critical Minerals Strategy is coming at the cost of our biodiversity, wetlands and ecological resilience. It is a mockery	WTC requests the Agency remove language regarding the Projects positive contribution to sustainability through strengthening Canada's critical mineral production. The Project will cause environmental degradation and ecological harm that will hinder sustainability.

		of environmental assessment to assert that this is a positive contribution to sustainability.	
--	--	---	--