

March 17, 2022

Note to file

Follow-up with Fort Resolution Metis Government on the Terms of Reference for the Pine Point Mine Project

Review Board staff met online with Fort Resolution Metis Government staff on March 17, 2022, to follow-up on the Terms of Reference for the Pine Point Mine Project.

Participants:

Fort Resolution Metis Government: Arthur Beck, Frank Fabien, Warren Delorme, Kevin Fabien, Savannah Lafferty, Teagan Larocque, Holly Beaulieu, Shawn Mckay, Katy Dimmer, Anang Yashim
Review Board staff: Eileen Marlowe, Mark Cliffe-Phillips, Alan Ehrlich, Chuck Hubert

Summary of discussion:

Review Board staff presented an overview of the structure of the Terms of Reference and described how and where the views of Fort Resolution Metis Government members were incorporated into the document. Slides from the presentation are attached to this Note to File.

Review Board staff also discussed engagement opportunities moving forward and answered questions from Fort Resolution Metis Government.

Information on the environmental assessment of the Pine Point Mine Project is here:

<https://reviewboard.ca/registry/ea2021-01>

A summary of the Pine Point Mine Project Terms of Reference is here:

https://reviewboard.ca/sites/default/files/news/files/7812_mve_summary_tor_web.pdf

Follow-up with Fort Resolution Metis Government

Terms of Reference
for the
Pine Point Mine Project

March 17, 2022



Outline

1. Overview and structure of [Pine Point Mine Project - Terms of Reference](#)
2. How your views were incorporated
3. Engagement opportunities during the EA
4. Workplan
5. How can the Review Board assist you in advancing community involvement in next steps in the EA?



Scoping phase 2021 – how we got here



- February – EA Initiation Package, referral to EA by Review Board
- March – EA start-up (online)

- May – Technical scoping meetings (online)
- May/June – comments on EA Initiation Package (Online Review System)

- June/July - Community scoping meetings (in person and online)
- August – draft Terms of Reference for public comment (Online Review System)

- Sept/Oct – comments from parties and responses from PPML
- Nov – Review Board issues final Terms of Reference



Terms of Reference - document structure

1. Introduction
 2. Scope of development and scope of assessment
 3. Overall approach to assessing impacts
 4. Changes to air and land
 - impacts to biophysical environment
 - assessing impacts on people and communities
 - using a holistic lens and systems thinking
 5. General requirements
- Appendices
- guidance documents, assessment methodology, baseline information



Overall approach to assessing impacts

- describe baseline conditions and existing environment
- predict and assess impacts on environment and people
- assess impacts holistically using **systems approach**
- use and incorporation of **traditional knowledge**
- address cumulative effects including **legacy of past mining**
- sustainability and **lasting well-being for people** and communities
- consider impacts of project on **climate change** (and the reverse)



Assessing impacts

Changes to air and land

- air, noise and vibration, visual, terrain and soil

Impacts on biophysical environment

- groundwater, surface water, fish and aquatic life, vegetation
- caribou, moose, furbearers, other wildlife, birds, species at risk, whooping crane

Impacts on people and communities

- Indigenous land use, other land use, heritage resources, culture
- social and economic conditions, economy and employment, human health

Holistic lens and systems approach

- keeping water clean and safe, lasting well-being, sustainable caribou



Incorporating your recommendations into the Terms of Reference



Assessment methodology (engagement)

Direct the developer to **involve potentially affected Indigenous Governments** in all aspects of preparing Developer's Assessment Report:

- scope of development
- baseline data collection
- describing project interactions with environment and people
- characterization of impacts
- mitigation measures
- significance of impacts after mitigation
- monitoring



Incorporating comments from Indigenous Governments

- **assessment methods that include engagement in all steps**
- **participation of Indigenous governments** in gathering data
- use of Traditional Knowledge
- well-being – separate out the components, not just “socio-economic”

- maintaining safe and clean water, linkage between ground and surface water
- boreal caribou and other wildlife values
- cultural values, trails, traditional land use
- **legacy from past mining**



Incorporating comments from Indigenous Governments

Scope of assessment

- Geographic scope expanded to the east to **include Little Buffalo River and Birch Creek**
 - water quality, fish resources, wildlife movement and travel for people
- railbed is on **both federal and territorial** lands
- **use of public highways** and rail yard
- **communities want to be involved in monitoring** and adaptive management programs



Incorporating comments from Indigenous Governments

Traditional and Indigenous Knowledge

- show how Traditional Knowledge **was used to understand current use of site by wildlife, and for impact predictions**
- **Include Indigenous** groups when identifying:
 - all habitat studies
 - all wildlife baseline studies
 - ecological risk assessment
- explicitly mention when and where TK is used
- emphasis on **community-led Indigenous Knowledge studies**
- **support affected Indigenous groups** in the collection and analysis of Traditional Knowledge



Incorporating comments from Indigenous Governments

Communities and people

- developer to **engage communities** to determine appropriate scale for assessing impacts (community, region)
- **engage TK holders**
- assess how sub-groups in communities will be affected by the project
- how project increases Indigenous training, capacity building
- describe how community businesses can provide goods and services
- impacts to health and culture



Incorporating cumulative effects

- **clear direction** on how to consider impacts from past mining combined with current project
- assessment of **trends-over-time**
- **collaborate with Indigenous groups** on cumulative effects
- **describe all past reclamation** efforts
- discuss how **project can affect ongoing reclamation efforts** (such as railbed)



Workplan next steps – analytical phase

- **Communities work with PPML to prepare Developer's Assessment Report**
- **Communities work with PPML on TK studies**
- Developer's Assessment Report submitted
- Adequacy Review by Review Board and responses from PPML
- Reasons for Decision on why EA can proceed to public review

- Information requests on DAR from parties/responses from PPML
- **Community meetings**
- Technical sessions
- Undertakings from PPML and others
- Information requests (if necessary)



Next steps – hearing phase, decision phase

- Parties submit interventions (technical reports)
- PPML submits responses
- Pre-hearing conference facilitated by Review Board staff
- Parties submit hearing presentations, Developer submits presentation

- Technical hearings
- **Community hearings**
- Hearing undertakings
- Closing arguments from parties and developer
- Report of EA and Reasons for Decision from Review Board
- Minister's decision



Next steps

How can the Review Board assist you in
advancing community involvement in next steps
in the EA?

