2023-2024 OSM WORK PLAN APPLICATION

This form will be used to assess the merits of the proposed work plan and its fit with the Oil Sands Monitoring (OSM) Program mandate and strategic priorities. Applicants must complete the form in its entirety. Applicants that fail to use this form and complete all sections in the timeframe will not be considered.

OSM Work Plan Submission Deadline: The deadline for submission of proposed work plans is ***October 31, 2022 at 4:30 PM Mountain Standard time.*** *Late submissions will not be accepted.*	***October 31, 2022*** *4:30 PM MST*
Decision Notification	*Mid to Late March 2023*

Work Plan Completion

Please ***Enable Macros*** *on the form when prompted.*

The applicant is required to provide information in sufficient detail to allow the evaluation team to assess the work plan. Please follow the requirements/instructions carefully while at the same time being concise in substantiating the project's merits. *The OSM Program is not responsible for the costs incurred by the applicant in the preparation and submission of any proposed work plan.*

Privacy: *The OSM Program is governed by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP) and may be required to disclose information received under this Application, or other information delivered to the OSM Program in relation to a Project, when an access request is made by anyone in the public. Applicants are encouraged to familiarize themselves with FOIP. All work plans are public documents.*

Technical Requirements: When working on this form, please maintain Macros compatibility by always saving your draft and your final submission as a **Microsoft Word Macro-Enabled Document**, failure to do so will result in loss of form functionality**.** This form was created using Microsoft word 2016 on a PC and may not have functionality on other versions of Microsoft on PC or MACS.

Government Lead/Coordinator: All work plans under the OSM Program require either a government lead or a government coordinator. This will ensure that the financial tables (for Alberta Environment and Parks & Environment and Climate Change Canada) are completed accurately for work plan consideration. ***However,*** *if an* ***Indigenous community, environmental nongovernmental organization*** *or any other* ***external partner*** *is completing a work plan proposal, they would* ***only*** *complete the* ***grant or contract budget component*** *of the* ***Human Resources & Financials Section*** *for their project. The government coordinator within Alberta Environment & Parks would be responsible for completing the remaining components of the Human Resources and Financial Section of this Work Plan Application, as they are responsible for contract and grant facilitation of successful submissions. All other sections outside of* ***Human Resources & Financials Section*** *of this work plan proposal are to be completed in full by all applicants.*

Supplemental Materials: *The OSM Program recognizes that majority of work planning submissions are a result of joint effort and monitoring expertise. Should the applicant wish to submit supplemental materials in addition to their application additional resources are available in the Work Planning Package accessible here:* **2023-24 Work Planning Package (Ctrl+CLICK)**

Should you have any ***questions*** *about completing this work planning form or uploading your final submission documents, please send all inquiries by email to:* **OSM.Info@gov.ab.ca**.

WORK PLAN SUBMISSION

*Upon completion of this application, please submit the appropriately named work plan (**Microsoft Word Macro-Enabled Document**) and all supporting documents to the link provided below. Failure to follow the naming convention provided may result in oversight of your application.*

*Please upload (by drag and dropping) the **WORK PLAN SUBMISSION & ALL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** here:*

WORK PLAN SUBMISSION LINK (CTRL+CLICK HERE)

Please use the following file naming convention when submitting your WORK PLAN:

202324_wkpln_WorkPlanTitle_ ProjectLeadLastNameFirstName

Example:

202324_wkpln_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue_SmithJoe

If applicable, **please use the following file naming convention when submitting your supplementary or supporting files.** Please number them according to the guidance and examples provided:

202324_sup##_WorkPlanTitle_ ProjectLeadLastNameFirstName

Examples:

202324_sup01_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue_SmithJoe

202324_sup02_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue_SmithJoe

.

.

.

202324_sup10_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue_SmithJoe

Do not resave your work plan or documents under any other naming conventions. *If you need to make revisions and resubmit before the work planning deadline of October 31, 2022, **DO NOT** rename your submission. When resubmitting, simply resubmit with the exact naming convention so that it replaces the original submission. **DO NOT** add any additional components such as versioning or dates to the file naming convention. Please direct any questions regarding the submission or naming of submissions to **OSM.Info@gov.ab.ca**.*

Work Plan Application

PROJECT INFORMATION	
Project Title:	CLFN Community Based monitoring Program
Lead Applicant, Organization, or Community:	Cold Lake First Nations
Work Plan Identifier Number: *If this is an on-going project please fill the identifier number for 22/23 fiscal by adjusting the last four digits:* ***Example:*** *D-1-2223 would become D-1-****2324***	Click or tap here to enter text.
Project Region(s):	Cold Lake
Project Start Year: *First year funding under the OSM program was received for this project (if applicable)*	2023
Project End Year: *Last year funding under the OSM program is requested* ***Example: 2024***	2027
Total 2023/24 Project Budget: *For the 2023/24 fiscal year*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Requested OSM Program Funding: *For the 2023/24 fiscal year*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Project Type:	Community Based Monitoring
Project Theme:	Cross-cutting
Anticipated Total Duration of Projects (Core and Focused Study (3 years))	3 Years
Current Year	**Focused Study:** Year 2 of 3
	Core Monitoring: Year 4

CONTACT INFORMATION	
Lead Applicant/ Principal Investigator: Every work plan application requires one lead applicant. This lead is accountable for the entire work plan and all deliverables.	James Janvier
Job Title:	CBM Lead
Organization:	Cold Lake First Nations
Address:	PO Box 2024
Phone:	780-815-1869
Email:	jim.janvier@clfns.com

PROJECT SUMMARY

Should your application be successful, The OSM Program reserves the right to publish this work plan application. Please check the box below to acknowledge you have read and understand:

☒ *I acknowledge and understand*

In the space below please provide a summary (300 words max) of the proposed project that includes a brief overview of the project drivers and objectives, the proposed approach/methodology, project deliverables, and how the project will deliver to the OSM Program objectives. The summary should be written in plain language.

The CLFN Community based monitoring program builds on several years of leadership and integrates several OSM theme areas into a community based, community led and community driven approach to monitoring. Our work enhances community confidence in key metrics such as fish health and is gradually expanding into terrestrial biological monitoring as the program rolls out landscape units in CLFN territory. Within the scope and resources of the program, CLFN attempts to focus its efforts on filling local gaps in monitoring while addressing key concerns of indigenous land users. Our approach is to work collaboratively with other PI's in the program including discipline leads and other communities.

Internally, this program operates out of the CLFN English Bay reserve using mostly CLFN members for staff. We pride ourselves on limiting our reliance on outside expertise and providing an ongoing opportunity for youth, members, and elders to engage directly with program staff.

The focus of this year is adding the long anticipated roll out of Terrestrial Biological Monitoring Landscape units and expanding fish work to include small bodied fish and Benthic Macro invertebrates. As we deploy this work, we intend to calculate sampling with TBM and air work as well as develop some methods that support a comparison to EIA baselines. Our intention is to deploy muskrat monitoring this year however National Defence currently will not grant access trapping in the majority of the CLAWR despite the fact that these activities are approved.

1.0 Merits of the Work Plan

All work plans under the OSM Program must serve the mandate of the program by determining (1) if changes in indicators are occurring in the oil sands region and (2) if the changes are caused by oil sands development activities and (3) the contribution in the context of cumulative effects. In the space below please provide information on the following:

- *Describe the key drivers for the project identifying linkages to Adaptive Monitoring framework particularly as it relates to surveillance, confirmation and limits of change (as per OC approved Key Questions).*
- *Explain the knowledge gap as it relates to the Adaptive Monitoring that is being addressed along with the context and scope of the problem as well as the Source – pathway – Receptor Conceptual Models .*
- *Describe how the project meets the mandate of the OSM Program or areas of limited knowledge is the work being designed to answer with consideration for the TAC specific Scope of Work Document (attached) and the Key Questions (attached)?*
- *Discuss results of previous monitoring/studies/development and* what has been achieved to date. Please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

This program is primarily focused on closing data gaps with effects based surveillance of receptors as defined by both western science and indigenous knowledge systems. Our program assesses the impact of oil sands development and contributes to publicly available reporting. It integrates community driven and ore program objectives using scalable methodologies with a regional focus.

The biodiversity component of this program will deploy the BADR framework as well as add in specific indigenous indicators of concern around plants and muskrat. The methods proposed for community driven indicators are relevant at the local scale and use methodologies that can easily be scaled to the regional level. CLFN is actively working with other communities to deploy these scaled methods as a common standard in the in-situ region. Community driven methods focus on both attribution of cause and limits of change by measuring species of interest across relevant gradients. These components are considered pilot focused studies on Indigenous Rights and Culture and their long term utility to the monitoring program should be debated in the future. They do have the potential to inform investigation of solutions to impact – particularly the berry productivity work. The larger BADR framework has been evaluated at length by the OSM program and we refer reviewers to that workplan for a more extensive discussion of the core program. Regional scale biodiversity work is a major gap in the EEM framework for the Cold Lake area. This is highly relevant for management decisions, such as the Cold Lake Sub Regional plan, which is proceeding without a solid understanding of the limits of change.

The Aquatics component of this program combines CLFN led work with OSM core monitoring. Our aquatics program focuses on surveillance of effects that impact both western science and indigenous indicators of aquatic health. Stressors in this region are much different than in the Athabasca. The program does some work on contaminants of concern, but the primary focus is changes to ecosystem heath.

CLFN leads fisheries work focusing surveillance of the health of subsistence fish species in the Cold Lake Oil Sands region. This work provides tissue samples for analysis by the OSM program as well as a large dataset for management and trend evaluation. This year CLFN will work on adding more lakes into the rotation for monitoring using the methods set out by ALMS and Benthic Macro Invertebrate monitoring coordinated through Environment Canada. This will provide a standardized – region wide- approach to aquatic monitoring. In addition, CLFN is working on deploying instrumentation in several key watersheds and collects a dataset of basic water parameters using a YSI probe and basic lab analysis. This work is conducted as surveillance on indicators and resources of high value to the community. The long term dataset supports investigation of cause if changes are observed. Small-bodied fish will sampled from 4 different lakes in CLFNs territory(Burnt Lake, May Lake, Marie Lake, and Ethel Lake). This small-bodied fish work will look at assemblages as well as creating homogenous mixture of 10 fish to send in for contaminant analysis. This data will then be compared to a recent EIA submitted in 2016.

All data collected will be submitted to the OSM program and will be available to use in the State of Environment report.

2.0 Objectives of the Work Plan

List in point form the Objectives of the 2023/24 work plan below

-Continue to investigate the effects of winter access roads on pitcher plants
-Continue pilot work on berry abundance
-Continue Regional Muskrat Surveillance program
-Support Deployment of a BADR Landscape Unit in the region and begin long term monitoring
-Build capacity for TBM monitoring
-Deploy community based surveillance fisheries monitoring program
-Contribute tissue samples to the OSM aquatic monitoring program for contaminants analysis.
-Deploy ALMS lake monitoring program in the region
-Work with ECCC on BMI surveys
-Conduct small-bodied fish work in 4 lakes
-Compare small-bodied fish contaminants to recent EIA
-Document small-bodied fish assemblages in the 4 sampled lakes
-Work with ABMI on camera set up and retrieval within regional landscape unit
-support ongoing training in CBM methods for other communities

3.0 Scope

Evaluation of Scope Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)
Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would:

- be in scope of the OSM Program (e.g., regional boundaries, specific to oil sands development, within boundaries of the Oil Sands Environmental Monitoring Program Regulation)
- consider the TAC-specific Scope of Work document and the key questions
- integrate western science with Indigenous Community-Based Monitoring)
- address the Adaptive Monitoring particularly as it relates to surveillance, confirmation and limits of change as per approved Key Questions.
- have an experimental design that addresses the Pressure/Stressor, Pathway/Exposure, Response continuum
- produce data/knowledge aligned with OSM Program requirements and is working with Service Alberta
- uses Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods including for Indigenous Community-Based Monitoring

3.1 Sub Theme

Please select from the dropdown menu below the theme(s) your monitoring work plan relates to:

Cross Cutting

3.2 Core Monitoring or Focused study

Please select from the dropdown menu below if the monitoring in the work plan is "core monitoring" and/or a "focused study". Core monitoring are long term monitoring programs that have been in operation for at least 3 years, have been previously designated by the OSM program as core, and will continue to operate into the future. Focused studies are short term projects 1-2 years that address a specific emerging issue. For the purposes of 2023/24 work planning all Community Based Monitoring Projects are Focused Studies.

Focused Study (includes Community-Based Monitoring)

3.3 Sub Theme Key Questions

Please select from the dropdown menus below the sub-theme(s) your monitoring work plan relates to and address the Key Questions:

3.3.1 Surface Water Theme

3.3.1.1. Sub Themes:

Cross Cutting

3.4.1.2 Surface Water Key Questions

Explain how your surface water monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

No

2. Are changes occurring in water quality, biological health (e.g., benthos, fish) and/or water quantity/flows relative to baseline? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

This project assesses changes in both biotic and abiotic factors. It looks at fish health through standard fish health exams as well as contaminant analysis. It also assesses benthos heath using the CABIN protocol looking at the relative abundance of species. It monitors changes water quality which are primarily linked to cumulative effects pathways as opposed to contaminants of concern. Monitor more lakes using the sampling and monitoring methods developed by ALMS. This monitors the receptor and how lake are changing over time. Small-bodied fish will be sampled in 4 lakes that are connected by marie creek. The program will look at specie abundance as well as contaminant analysis. A sample of at 10 fish be sent in as homogenous mixture. The value we receive from this will be compared to a recent EIA that was submitted in 2016.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

No

4. Are changes in water quality and/or water quantity and/or biological health informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Our work on Large-bodied fish and water potability specifically addresses community concerns. Water quality, benthos, and small-bodied fish address ecosystem health concerns.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Yes

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Yes

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Our work uses and promotes integrated methods between communities. CLFN helps support neighboring communities by providing training and logistical support on fisheries and water quality

monitoring. We participate in cross community activities and support region-wide program development.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Our program focuses on receptors and their response

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

This program is, over time, moving from primary indigenous indicators into more responsive indicators. Eg, moving from a focus on fish people harvest and consume an into small bodies fish.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.

3.3.2 Groundwater Theme

3.3.2.1 Sub Themes:

Choose an item.

3.3.2.2 Groundwater Key Questions

Explain how your groundwater monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in groundwater quality and/or quantity relative to baseline? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? *(Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models)* and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in groundwater quality and/or quantity informing Indigenous key questions and concerns Indigenous concerns and health?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.

3.3.3 Wetlands Theme

3.3.3.1 Sub Themes:

Choose an item.

3.3.3.2 Wetlands - Key Questions

Explain how your wetlands monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in wetlands due to contaminants and hydrological processes? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models) and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in wetlands informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.

3.3.4 Air Theme

3.3.4.1 Sub Themes:

Choose an item.

3.3.4.2 Air & Deposition - Key Questions

Explain how your air & deposition monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes occurring in air quality? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models) and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Are changes in air quality informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.

3.3.5 Terrestrial Biology Theme

3.3.5.1 Sub Themes:

Cross-Cutting

3.3.5.2 Terrestrial Biology - Key Questions

Explain how your terrestrial biological monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Has baseline been established? Have thresholds or limits of change been identified?

No

2. Are changes occurring in terrestrial ecosystems due to contaminants and landscape alteration? If yes, is there evidence that the observed change is attributable to oil sands development? (Describe source-pathway-receptor and/or conceptual models) and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Please see the TBM core work plan for a full discussion of the BADR design. CLFN will lead two complimentary components to BADR that focus on changes in plant abundance in the oil sands region. Pitcher plants are thought to be directly impacted by the construction of winter access roads and this project will attempt to quantify this effect. Blueberry productivity is observed to be declining in the region and this work looks at the problem as a cumulative effects issue. This is very different than past attempts at berry work which defined the problem as a contaminants issue. The berry work looks at productivity across several disturbance types and stand ages to gain an understanding of how forest conditions impact productivity. We will also support the Regional Muskrat Surveillance work led by ECCC (see attached sub workplan) for a full discussion. This program supports the characterization of muskrat heath across regional gradients of oil sands impacts and cumulative effects. Camera monitoring that is being coordinated with ABMI will look at wildlife abundance across multiple different disturbance types. This will answer questions such as what disturbance affects what wildlife.

3. Are there unanticipated results in the data? If yes, is there need for investigation of cause studies?

No

4. Are changes in terrestrial ecosystems informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

The BADR method is well formulated to support answering key questions about changes in biodiversity. CLFN is adding three components that specifically address indigenous concerns in the region. In future it is likely that we will build more on the BADR methods once there is an LU in the area. The camera monitoring also fits into the community concern about wildlife abundance within industry impacted areas.

5. Are data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Yes

6. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Yes

7. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Out TBM work is fully integrated with the BADR program and the methods have been co-designed by the BADR PI's. these methods are designed to be easy to scale and will be made readily available for other

communities in the program. We are doing the pitcher plant work in collaboration with CPDFN and we see obvious future linkages with the wetland theme area. We are also participating in the Regional Muskrat Surveillance Program which focuses heavily on collaboration with other communities and other theme areas. We will also conducting camera set up and retrieveal with ABMI within the Landscape unit near CLFNs territory.

8. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

This program primarly focuses on the recptors of oil sands impacts.

9. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

This program is, over time, moving from primary indigenous indicators into more responsive indicators. Eg, moving from a focus on fish people harvest and consume an into small bodies fish. Focused studies on berries and medicinal plants are builing an understanding of the impact of seasonal factors relative to oil sands impact. These are incremental steps being taken at the community level to transition into an adaptive framework based on confidence in key indicators.

10. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Data submitted to the program is available for use in the SOE report.

3.3.6 Cross-Cutting Across Theme Areas

3.3.6.1 Sub Themes:

Choose an item.

If "Other" was selected from the drop down list above please describe below:

Click or tap here to enter text.

3.3.6.2 Cross-Cutting - Key Questions

Explain how your cross-cutting monitoring program addresses the key questions below.

1. Is data produced following OSM Program requirements and provided into the OSM Program data management system?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Do methodologies use relevant Standard Operating Procedures/ Best Management Practices/ Standard Methods?

Click or tap here to enter text.

3. How does the monitoring identify integration amongst projects, themes or with communities?

Click or tap here to enter text.

4. With consideration for adaptive monitoring, where does the proposed monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. How will this work advance understanding transition towards adaptive monitoring?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? If yes, please identify potential linkages to relevant sections of the State of Environment Report.

Click or tap here to enter text.

4.0 Mitigation

Evaluation of Mitigation Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)
Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially inform:

- efficacy of an existing regulation or policy
- an EPEA approval condition
- a regional framework (i.e., LARP)
- an emerging issue

Explain how your monitoring program informs management, policy and regulatory compliance. As relevant consider adaptive monitoring and the approved Key Questions in your response.

Our work on aquatics draws its links most closely with fisheries management policy. Alberta manages the fishery for conservation, sportfishing and subsistence harvest. If catch levels change over time it could drive changes in sportfishing allocations. The water quality work we do could identify gaps in understanding of the effects of basin scale changes in disturbance levels. We work across a gradient of disturbance and fishing pressure to identify effects in time to change management policy. Our small-bodied fish work will focus on contaminant analysis. This will be compared to a baseline that was submitted in a EIA in 2016. If there are differences in data we can continue to monitor certain areas. Our benthos work will be completed using CABIN protocols. The benthos work will focus on invertebrate type with their correlation to water quality. Benthos work be worked in with our small-bodied fish work.

The TBM work we do has close links to the recently drafted Cold Lake Sub Regional Plan (CLSRP). The CLSRP is supposed to address the balance of disturbance on the land base in order to protect critical caribou habitat. This will require some substantial changes to management policy and it is important that monitoring work be robust. Over time, the changes in development patterns, restoration requirements, and wildlife management policy will have effects on both habitat and wildlife populations. Deploying the BADR method in this region will enhance the ability of both policy makers and regulators to make adaptive management decisions. Our work on key plants of concern to indigenous communities helps identify and describe impacts as well as provide context for ecosite specific management changes contained in the CLSRP. For example, pitcher plants are likely to occur in caribou biophysical habitat so caribou conservation measures could have a positive impact on pitcher plant communities in the CLSRP area. Camera deployment also fits into the CLSRP and will allow us to look at the abundance of animals within multiple types of disturbance.

5.0 Indigenous Issues

Evaluation of Indigenous Issues Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)
Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially:

- Investigate Indigenous communities key questions and concerns
- Includes culturally relevant receptor(s) and indicator(s)
- Include or be driven by Indigenous communities (participatory or collaborative)
- Develop capacity in Indigenous communities
- Include a Council Resolution or Letter of Support from one or more Indigenous communities
- Describe how ethics protocols and best practices regarding involvement of Indigenous peoples will be adhered to
- Provide information on how Indigenous Knowledge will be collected, interpreted, validated, and used in a way that meets community Indigenous Knowledge protocols

Explain how your monitoring activities are inclusive and respond to Indigenous key questions and concerns and inform the ability to understand impacts on concerns and inform Section 35 Rights

Our workplan is a community based monitoring program. We facilitate the deployment of western science approaches and combine this with key community indicators. This includes fish health, water quality, key plant species and wildlife abundance which are culturally relevant receptors. Our program builds the capacity of CLFN members to engage in monitoring by putting staff in the drivers seat to execute the work. Our approach to data management is to separate subjective and objective observations made by our program. Objective measurements, like fish weight or dissolved oxygen levels, are open by default and freely shared with the program. Subjective observations like fish taste or berry quality are not disclosed to the program and kept confidential by CLFN. The interpretation of both subjective and objective observations is done by CLFN in collaboration with staff and members. Wildlife abundance will inform community members the density of ungulates and fur bearing species in oil sands impacted areas.

Efforts this year will generate some dialogue in the community about TBM. CLFN has done intensive work in the context of caribou recovery around community concerns related to the impact of oil sands development, but the BADR approach is much broader. There are obvious opportunities to engage the community on a number of key issues (scope, scale, areas of concern, key indicators). CLFN has consistently taken the position that BADR should be deployed as designed first, and then we would have the discussion about whether it meets community needs.

Does this project include an Integrated Community Based Monitoring Component?

Yes

If YES, please complete the ICBM Abbreviated Work Plan Forms and submit using the link below

ICBM WORK PLAN SUBMISSION LINK (CTRL+CLICK HERE)

5.1 Alignment with Interim Ethical Guidelines for ICBM in the OSM Program

1. Are there any community specific protocols that will be followed?

CLFN follows it own internal processes around confidentiality, information release, participant waivers, and licencing of reporting. CLFN collects, stores and manages its own data – a capability that has been developed from over 30 years of community based knowledge collection. The OSM program does not do formal, structured, work on knowledge collectiotn. Instead we focus on intgrtating our knowledge holders into fied operations and project management to drive both he design and operation of the program.

2. Does the work plan involve methods for Indigenous participants to share information or knowledge (e.g. interview, focus group, survey/structured interview), or any other Indigenous participation? If yes, describe how risks and harms will be assessed, and the consent process that will be used.

CLFN does not intend to conduct structured information sharing.

3. Do the activities include any other collecting/sharing, interpreting, or applying Indigenous knowledge? Please describe how these activities will be conducted in alignment with the Interim Ethical Guidelines, and any community-based protocols and/or guidelines that may also apply.

no

4. Indicate how Indigenous communities / Indigenous knowledge holders will be involved to ensure appropriate analysis, interpretation and application of data and knowledge.

Knowledge holders work directly with the department on the colecioth of information and in most cases participate in reporting as well. The department is advised byu a committee that includes knowledge holders and elders.

5. How are Indigenous communities involved in identifying or confirming the appropriateness of approach, methods, and/or indicators?

CLFN works with community members and staff using a participatory approach to develop and monitor indicators. This approach is primarily based on having members lead field work and participate in the monitoring design. Our annual workplans are linked directly to operational plans that are submitted to leadership and administration annualy.

6. How does this work plan directly benefit your community? How does it support capacity building in your community?

Our program directly benefits the community in many ways. Our work is done primarily out of the English bay reserve where we are the largest single employer. We focus on providing opportunities for youth to engage and develop skills that support thewir interest in land based activities and the STEM field. We focus on capacity development through a combination of internal and external training including OSM field camp training and collaboration with neighbouring communityes. Our management team links with other CLFN departments such as education and employment and training to access apacity development resources in addition to those that we design ourselves or coordinate with external partners. Our monitoring program has beend evleoping capacity for several years and operates without significant input from external consultants. CLFN members develop and execute this program through a department of the Nation that is responsible to both council and the community.

7. How is the information from this work plan going to be reported back to your community in a way that is accessible, transparent and easy to understand?

We make information available to the communitythrough annual reporting as well as through one on one engagement with members. If anyone ever has a question we meet to discuss the issue and provide and honest assessment of what the OSM program shows about the impacts.

6.0 Measuring Change

Evaluation of Measuring Change Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)
Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially:

- assess changes in environmental conditions compared to baseline (e.g., validation of EIA predictions)
- report uncertainty in estimates and monitoring is of sufficient power to detect change due to oil sands development on reasonable temporal or spatial scales
- include indicators along the spectrum of response (e.g., individual, population, community)
- focus on areas of highest risk (where change is detected, where change is greater than expected, where development is expected to expand (collection of baseline)
- measure change along a stressor gradient or a stressor/reference comparison

Explain how your monitoring identifies environmental changes and how can be assessed against a baseline condition. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

Our general approach to measuring change is to look across disturbance gradients. We create these gradients at both the local and regional scales. This is a key reason why we partner with other communities – to increase the statistical power of the comparisons. The TBM work will be important in the future as the CLSRP begins to change disturbance and restoration patterns on the land base. Wherever possible we look at both individual and population metrics. This is particularly true for our fisheries work as we do detailed exams of individual fish but also track health at the population level. We intend to continue this approach with our muskrat surveillance. This year we are beginning to move into some areas where change can be measured against baselines from EIA's (small bodied fish).

7.0 Accounting for Scale

Evaluation of Accounting for Scale Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)
Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially be:

- appropriate to the key question and indicator of interest
- relevant to sub-regional and regional questions
- relevant to organism, population and/or community levels of biological organization
- where modelled results are validated with monitored data
- where monitoring informs on environmental processes that occur at a regional scale. e.g. Characterizing individual sources to gain a regional estimate of acid deposition and understand signal from individual contributing sources.

Explain how your monitoring tracks regional and sub-regional state of the environment, including cumulative effects. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

The scale for CLFN is its territory. It has been historically very difficult for anyone to conduct monitoring in the majority of CLFN territory because it is a military training facility (CLAWR). We try and cover as much of the territory as possible with our monitoring efforts but keep the measurement scales relevant to community members. Our work is primarily at the sub regional level and ideally will be closely linked to the CLSRP where the management of oil sands disturbance is being closely considered.

8.0 Transparency

Evaluation of Transparency Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)
Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would potentially include:

- a plan for dissemination of monitoring data, including appropriate timing, format, and aligns with OSM program data management plan
- demonstrated transparency in past performance
- identified an annual progress report as a deliverable
- reporting of monitoring results occurs at timing and format that is appropriate for recipient audience.

Explain how your monitoring generates data and reporting that is accessible, credible and useful. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

Our monitoring program provides data to the PI's of core programs who report that out through the OSM channels. In addition, we report to the CLFN community via the CLFN reporting channels which include directly to leadership, administration and the community. An annual report is created in plain language format.

9.0 Efficiency

Evaluation of Efficiency Criteria (Information Box Only- No action required)
Your workplan will be evaluated against the criteria below. A successful workplan would include:

- appropriately addressed a risk-informed allocation of resources
- identified the role and justification for each staff member on the proposed work plan
- identified in-kind and leveraged resources (e.g., resources and approaches are appropriately shared with other OSM projects where possible)
- established partnerships (value-added) and demonstrated examples of coordinated efficiencies (e.g., field, analytical)
- identified co-location of monitoring effort
- demonstrated monitoring activities and information collected are not duplicative
- considered sampling/measurement/methods compatibility to other data sources (e.g., AER)

Explain how your monitoring is integrated with other OSM projects and incorporates community-based participation and/or engagement in proposed monitoring activities. As relevant, consider adaptive monitoring, the TAC specific Scope of Work document and the Key Questions in your response.

Our work builds capacity at the community level to take over the local implementation of monitoring programs. Our FTE cost is half what the GOA uses for budgeting and we can deliver communication benefits in local communities. Our program leverages in kind contributions such as capital that OSM cannot pay for (boats, trucks, buildings, ATVs, etc.) and we operate out of buildings with utilities paid for by CLFN. Our insurance and financial auding costs are paid for by the department. We collaborate with neighboring nations at no cost and submit analytical work through the relevant OSM contracts. We work efficiently with core program PI's to avoid duplication Our and focus on filling gaps in existing monitoring coverage. Our programs function on seasonal staffing contracts with leads being assigned primary roles in execution.

10.0 Work Plan Approach/Methods

10.1 List the Key Project Phases and Provide Bullets for Each Major Task under Each Project Phase *

Aquatics monitoring:

-Conduct regional surveillance of fish heath and water quality
-Continue ALMS data collection protocol
-Dissect fish, collect samples and submit to laboratory
-Deploy and service dataloggers
- Take CABIN training and support BMI survey work
-Conduct Small Bodied Fish Survey work. Send samples for analysis and compare to baseline in the EIA documents.

Terrestrial Biological Monitoring:

-Support BADR LU wildlife camera / ARU deployment and service (PI dependent)
-Support BADR LU Wildlife data analysis
-Continue blueberry abundance monitoring (Sup 03)
-Continue Pitcher Plan Monitoring (Sup 02)
-conduct transect work to assess pitcher plant abundance
-continue to survey muskrat locations and plan trapping efforts
-trap muskrats
-dissect muskrats using standard protocols and submit samples (Sup 01)

10.2 Describe how changes in environmental Condition will be assessed *

Changes are assessed realitive to baseline data where it exists and relative to previous survailance monitoring where it does not. In some cases, data is compared to other communities in the region (muskrats). In other cases, change might be compared to a historical baseline linked to meaningful rights practice (berry productivity)(Ungulate and fur bearer abundance).

10.3 Are There Benchmarks Being Used to Assess Changes in Environmental Condition? If So, Please Describe, If Not, State "NONE" *****

Potability of surface water, Mercury guidelines in fish, historical baseline for berry productivity, wildlife abundance and Fur bearer abundance

(e.g., objectives, tiers, triggers, limits, reference conditions, thresholds, etc.)

10.4 Provide a Brief Description of the Western Science or Community-Based Monitoring Indigenous Community-Based Monitoring Methods by Project Phase *

Aquatics:

Fish are harvested with gill nets at 7 lakes in CLFN territory. Timing and methods are designed to replicate rights practice. The harvest is weighed, measured and inspected for deformities. A small subset (2-4) fish are dissected using the standard fish health exam procedure. Measurements are collected and samples are held for analysis in the future. Data is entered into a master spreadsheet. The majority of the fish is not dissected and is distributed to the community. We talk to community members and seek feedback on the quality of the fish we are providing. Whenever possible, we pull vertical logs of the water quality with a YSI probe (temperature, DO, conductivity, and chlorophyl). We are also conduct spot measurements

with a YSI probe in tributaries and places where members might swim. We are also deploying Hobo dataloggers for basic parameter (temperature, water level etc.). Periodically we collect water samples and submit them for routine potability. We will collect small-bodied fish from 4 lakes within CLFNs traditional territory (Burnt Lake, May Lake, Marie Lake, and Ethel Lake). Ten fish will be combined to create a homogenous solution that will be sent in for contaminant analysis. This will be done for each of the lakes. The samples from May Lake and Marie Lake will be compared to a recent EIA submitted in 2016. Benthos work will occur once staff have received the CABIN training. Creek or rivers will selected based on substrate and then sampled at peak productivity. All sampling will be done according to CABIN sampling protocols.

Terrestrial Biological Monitoring:

CLFN will work with the core program on BADR LU deployment. Please see the core TBM program for details. For the Blueberry productivity work we locate transects in A1 jack pine stands containing berry plants. Transects in oil sands areas are located across a disturbance feature and three plots (3m2) are collected at the edge, interior and control locations. At each plot we harvest all the berries, weigh them, and estimate the volume. We also collect canopy closure, vegetation data and core trees to establish the stand age. This year we will deploy soil temperature / moisture loggers at a subset of sites. A detailed Pitcher plant survey methodology is contained in an addendum to this proposal. We will continue monitoring our 5 locations, as well as add 3 more locations and survey pitcher plants on transects that cross winter road features. Muskrat work will be conducted under the Regional Muskrat Surveillance program (methodology attached). CLFN will scout locations to help understand muskrat house density and then select a subset of locations across disturbance gradients to trap muskrats for dissection. Samples will be submitted to ECCC along with all the relevant information. CLFN with be working alongside ABMI in wildlife camera monitoring. CLFN staff will be trained camera set-up, retrieval, and wildlife picture analysis. Cameras will be set-up in variety of disturbance types(pads, roads, and plant sites) as well as monitoring grid within the CLAWR. Cameras will be left up for a set amount of time and then retrieved and analyzed.

10.5 List the Key Indicators Measured, If Not Applicable, State N/A *****

Fish harvest levels
Fish condition
fish stomach fat
Fish size
Fish quality
Small bodied fish species assemblage and mercury concentration
water temperature, Dissolved Oxygen levels, chlorophyll
water potability
Blueberry abundance
pitcher plant abundance
muskrat abundance
muskrat condition
Other Fur bearer abundance
Ungulate Abundance

11.0 Knowledge Translation

In the space below, please provide the following:

- *Describe the plan for knowledge transfer and distribution of learnings from the project. This could include workshops, publications, best practice documentation, marketing plan, etc.*
- *Demonstrate that the knowledge transfer plan is appropriate for the intended end-users.*

CLFN work with other communities and PI's to produce training materials for methods. We also report to the community through appropriate channels including face-to-face interaction. Our primary reporting channel is to administration and from there to leadership and the community. We report to the OSM program through annual reports and the submission of data. Where possible, we attend workshops and present at conferences.

12.0 External Partners

List by project or project phase each component that will be delivered by an external party (including analytical laboratories) and name the party. Describe and name the associate work plan/grant/contract for these services. * state none if not required

Routine potability- ALS Laboratories Mercury in fish tissue – U of A Muskrat tissue samples – ECCC All analytical work is coordinated through PI's with the exception of routine Potability

*To ensure complete work plan proposal submission, all grants and contracts listed in this section should also be captured in Grants & Contracts.

13.0 Data Sharing and Data Management

For 2022-23 the following approach will be taken by the OSM Program related to data sharing.

For all work plans of a **western science** nature funded under the OSM Program, data sharing is a condition of funding and must align with the principle of **"Open by Default"**. In this case, all data is to be shared with the OSM Program as directed by the OSM Program Data Management work plan.

For all work plans involving **Indigenous Knowledge** as defined below and funded under the OSM Program, data sharing is a condition of funding and the Indigenous Knowledge components of the work plan must align with the principle of **"Protected by Default".** In this case, all data as defined as Indigenous Knowledge, are to be retained by the Indigenous community to which the Indigenous Knowledge is held.

Indigenous Knowledge is defined as:

> "The knowledge held by First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples, the Aboriginal peoples of Canada. Traditional knowledge is specific to place, usually transmitted orally, and rooted in the experience of multiple generations. It is determined by an Aboriginal community's land, environment, region, culture and language. Traditional knowledge is usually described by Aboriginal peoples as holistic, involving body, mind, feelings and spirit. Knowledge may be expressed in symbols, arts, ceremonial and everyday practices, narratives and, especially, in relationships. The word tradition is not necessarily synonymous with old. Traditional knowledge is held collectively by all members of a community, although some members may have particular responsibility for its transmission. It includes preserved knowledge created by, and received from, past generations and innovations and new knowledge transmitted to subsequent generations. In international or scholarly discourse, the terms traditional knowledge and Indigenous knowledge are sometimes used interchangeably."

This definition was taken from the Canadian Government's Tri-council Policy Statement for Ethical Research involving Humans (Chapter 9, pg. 113) and is an interim definition specific to the Oil Sands Monitoring Program.

Data Sharing and Data Management Continued

13.1 Has there, or will there be, a Data Sharing agreement established through this Project? *

YES

13.2 Type of Quantitative Data Variables:

Both

13.3 Frequency of Collection:

Other

13.4 Estimated Data Collection Start Date:

2019-09-19

13.5 Estimated Data Collection End Date:

2024-09-19

13.6 Estimated Timeline For Upload Start Date:

2023-03-01

13.7 Estimated Timeline For Upload End Date:

2025-01-01

13.8 Will the data Include traditional knowledge as defined by and provided by an Indigenous representative, Community or Organization?

NO

TABLE 13.9 Please describe below the Location of Data and Data Type:

Add a Data Source by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table

Name of Dataset	Location of Dataset (E.g.: Path, Website, Database, etc.)	Data File Formats (E.g.: csv, txt, API, accdb, xlsx, etc.)	Security Classification
Fish Health Exams	CLFN Sahrepoint Server	.xlsx	Open by Default
Fish harvest	CLFN Sahrepoint Server	.xlsx	Open by Default
YSI logs	CLFN Sahrepoint Server	.xlsx	Open by Default
Water Logger Data	CLFN Sahrepoint Server	.xlsx	Open by Default

Muskrat Health Log	CLFN Sahrepoint Server	.xlsx	Open by Default

Ungulate Abundance Log	CLFN Sahrepoint Server	.xlsx	Open by Default

Fur Bearer Abundance Log	CLFN Sahrepoint Server	.xlsx	Open by Default

14.0 2023/24 Deliverables

Add an additional deliverable by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table.

Type of Deliverable	Delivery Date	Description
Technical Report	Q4	Annual Report

15.0 Project Team & Partners

In the space below please provide information on the following:

- *Describe key members of the project team, including roles, responsibilities and expertise relevant to the proposed project.*
- *Describe the competency of this team to complete the project.*
- *Identify any personnel or expertise gaps for successful completion of the project relative to the OSM Program mandate and discuss how these gaps will be addressed.*
- *Describe the project management approach and the management structure.*

Jim Janvier – CBM Lead- Diploma in Environmental Science – conservation and reclamation. CBM lead has worked with CLFN cbm program for 4 years. Has helped deploy the the Pitcher plant and Berry monitoring programs for CLFN and is a CLFN member.

Nikita Lattery – Data and Lab Tech- Diploma in Environmental Science- 2 Years experience with the CLFN CBM Program as a field and lab tech.

Findlay MacDermid – Dene Ni Nenne Manager - MSc in ecosystem biogeochemistry. CBM program lead and SIKIC member. Extensive experience deploying community based monitoring programs ad working the OSM program on integraiton

Rae Boisvert- forester, holds a masters degree in indigenous resource management. Former Alberta Parks employee and former instructor at Portage College. She supports the veg work and will train CLFN techs

Carla Incontri – Masters degree in GIS. She Supports the development and deployment of direct-to-digital data collection using ArcGIS online. She also supports site selection for the veg work.

Nicole Nichols- CLFN consultation manager. Nicole's background is in anthropology and she helps trive the community engagement and social science side of the work we do. She is also responsible for a lot of the stretigic direction of the program.

16.0 Project Human Resources & Financing

Section 16.1 Human Resource Estimates

Building off of the competencies listed in the previous section, please complete the table below. Add additional rows as necessary. This table must include **ALL staff involved** in the project, their role and the % of that staff's time allocated to this work plan. The AEP calculated amount is based on an estimate of $120,000/year for FTEs. This number cannot be changed. The OSM program recognizes that this is an estimate.

Table 16.1.1 AEP

Add an additional AEP Staff member by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. The total FTE (Full Time Equivalent) is Auto Summed (in Table 16.2.1) and converted to a dollar amount.

Name (Last, First)	Role	% Time Allocated to Project
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	0%

Table 16.1.2 ECCC

Add an additional ECCC Staff member by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. The total FTE (Full Time Equivalent) is Auto Summed in Table 16.2.2

Name (Last, First)	Role	% Time Allocated to Project
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	0%

The tables below are the financial tables for Alberta Environment & Parks (AEP) and Environment & Climate Change Canada. All work plans under the OSM Program require either a government lead or a government coordinator.

Section 16.2 Financing

The OSM Program recognizes that many of these submissions are a result of joint effort and monitoring initiatives. A detailed "PROJECT FINANCE BREAKDOWN" must be provided using the Project Finance Breakdown Template provided, accessible here (ctrl + click the link below). Please note that completion of this Project Finance Breakdown Template is mandatory and must be submitted along with each workplan.

PROJECT FINANCE BREAKDOWN TEMPLATE (CTRL+CLICK HERE)

Table 16.2.1 Funding Requested BY ALBERTA ENVIRONMENT & PARKS

Organization – Alberta Environment & Parks ONLY	Total % time allocated to project for AEP staff	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits *(Calculated from Table 16.1.1 above)*	**0.00%**	**$0.00**
Operations and Maintenance		
Consumable materials and supplies		$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel		$0.00
Project-related travel		$0.00
Engagement		$0.00
Reporting		$0.00
Overhead		$0.00
Total All Grants *(Calculated from Table 16.4 below)*		**$539,210.00**
Total All Contracts *(Calculated from Table 16.5 below)*		**$0.00**
Sub- TOTAL *(Calculated)*		**$539,210.00**
Capital*		$0.00
AEP TOTAL *(Calculated)*		**$539,210.00**

* The Government of Alberta Financial Policies (*Policy # A600*) requires that all **capital asset** purchases comply with governmental and departmental legislation, policies, procedures, directives and guidelines. **Capital assets** (*Financial Policy # A100*, Government of Alberta, January 2014) are tangible assets that: have economic life greater than one year; are acquired, constructed, or developed for use on a continuing basis; are not held for sale in ordinary course of operations; are recorded and tracked centrally; have a cost greater than $5,000.

Some **examples of capital asset equipment include:** laboratory equipment, appliances, boats, motors, field equipment, ATV's/snowmobiles, stationary equipment (pier/sign/weather), fire/safety equipment, pumps/tanks, heavy equipment, irrigation systems, furniture, trailers, vehicles, etc. (*Financial Policy # A100*, Government of Alberta, January 2014).

Table 16.2.2 Funding Requested BY ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE CHANGE CANADA

Organization – Environment & Climate Change Canada ONLY	Total % time allocated to project for ECCC staff	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits FTE *(Please manually provide the number in the space below)*		
Salaries and Benefits		$0.00
Operations and Maintenance		
Consumable materials and supplies		$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel		$0.00
Project-related travel		$0.00
Engagement		$0.00
Reporting		$0.00
Overhead		$0.00
ECCC TOTAL *(Calculated)*		**$0.00**

* ECCC cannot request capital under the OSM program. Any capital requirements to support long-term monitoring under the OSM program should be procured by Alberta and captured in that budget table.

Table 16.3

Complete ONE table per Grant recipient.

Add a Recipient by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. The total of all Grants is Auto Summed in Table 16.2.1

GRANT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Name	Cold Lake First Nations
GRANT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	Cold Lake First Nations(Indigenous Community)
Category	**Total Funding Requested from OSM**
Salaries and Benefits	$487,575.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies	$41,635.00
Conferences and meetings travel	$0.00
Project-related travel	$10,000.00
Engagement	$0.00
Reporting	$0.00
Overhead	$0.00
GRANT TOTAL *(Calculated)*	**$539,210.00**

Table 16.4

Complete ONE table per Contract recipient.

Add a Recipient by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table. This section is only to be completed should the applicant intend to contract components or stages of the project out to external organizations. The total of all Contracts is Auto Summed in Table 16.2.1

CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Name	Click or tap here to enter text.
CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	Click or tap here to enter text.
Category	**Total Funding Requested from OSM**
Salaries and Benefits	$0.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies	$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel	$0.00
Project-related travel	$0.00
Engagement	$0.00
Reporting	$0.00
Overhead	$0.00
CONTRACT TOTAL *(Calculated)*	**$0.00**

Table 16.5 GRAND TOTAL Project Funding Requested from OSM Program

The table below is auto calculated, please do not try to manually manipulate these contents.

Category	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits ***Sums totals for salaries and benefits from AEP and ECCC ONLY***	$0.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies *Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY*	$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel *Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY*	$0.00
Project-related travel *Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY*	$0.00
Engagement *Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY*	$0.00
Reporting *Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY*	$0.00
Overhead *Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY*	$0.00
Total All Grants (from table 16.2.1 above) *Sums totals for AEP Tables ONLY*	$539,210.00
Total All Contracts (from table 16.2.1 above) *Sums totals for AEP Tables ONLY*	$0.00
Sub- TOTAL	$539,210.00
Capital* *Sums total for AEP*	$0.00
GRAND PROJECT TOTAL	$539,210.00

Some **examples of capital asset equipment include:** laboratory equipment, appliances, boats, motors, field equipment, ATV's/snowmobiles, stationary equipment (pier/sign/weather), fire/safety equipment, pumps/tanks, heavy equipment, irrigation systems, furniture, trailers, vehicles, etc. (*Financial Policy # A100*, Government of Alberta, January 2014).

17.0 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The OSM Program reserves the right to reallocate project funding during the current fiscal year on the basis of project performance and financial overspend or underspend.

☒ *Please check this box to acknowledge you have read and understand*

In the space below please describe the following:

- *Discuss how potential cost overruns and cost underruns will be managed.*
- *If this is a continuing project from last year, identify if this project was overspent or underspent in the previous year and explain why.*
- *Describe what risks and/or barriers may affect this project.*

Cost management will be done in collaboration with the program office. This application is being written only half way throurh the 22-23 grant cycle so it is impossible to say if it will be over or under spent. Histoircaly CLFN has brought these projects in on time and on budget. The biggest risks to CLFN are CLAWR access and staffing.

18.0 Alternate Sources of Project Financing – In-Kind Contributions

Table 18.1 In-kind Contributions

Add an In Kind Contribution by clicking on the table and then clicking on the blue "+" symbol on the bottom right side of table.

DESCRIPTION	SOURCE	EQUIVALENT AMOUNT ($CAD)
Office Space	CLFN	30000
Insurance	CLFN	6000
	TOTAL	**$0.00**

19.0 Consent & Declaration of Completion

Lead Applicant Name

Jim Janvier

Title/Organization

CBM Lead

Signature

Jim Janvier

Date

2022-10-31

Government Lead / Government Coordinator Name (if different from lead applicant)

Click or tap here to enter text.

Title/Organization

Click or tap here to enter text.

Signature

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date

Click or tap to enter a date.

PROGRAM OFFICE USE ONLY

Governance Review & Decision Process

this phase follows submission and triggers the Governance Review

TAC Review (Date):

Click or tap to enter a date.

ICBMAC Review (Date):

Click or tap to enter a date.

SIKIC Review (Date):

Click or tap to enter a date.

OC Review (Date):

Click or tap to enter a date.

Final Recommendations:

Decision Pool:

Choose an item.

Notes:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Post Decision: Submission Work Plan Revisions Follow-up Process

This phase will only be implemented if the final recommendation requires revisions and follow-up from governance

ICBMAC Review (Date):

Click or tap to enter a date.

SIKIC Review (Date):

Click or tap to enter a date.

OC Review (Date):

Click or tap to enter a date.

Comments:

Decision Pool:

Choose an item.

Notes & Additional Actions for Successful Work Plan Implementation:

Click or tap here to enter text.