



2022-2023 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 5, 2021 at 4:30 PM Mountain Standard time.	October 5, 2021 4:30 PM MST
Decision Notification	Mid to Late January 2022

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.

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.

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.

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.**

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 Form and Distribution Package, accessible here: [Work Planning Form and Distribution Package](#)

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**:

202223_wkpln_WorkPlanTitle_ProjectLeadLastNameFirstName

Example:

202223_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:

202223_sup##_WorkPlanTitle_ProjectLeadLastNameFirstName

Examples:

202223_sup01_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue_SmithJoe

202223_sup02_OilSandsResiduesinFishTissue_SmithJoe

.
. .
. .

202223_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 5, 2021, **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:	Ni ho ghe di – Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation Community Based Monitoring
Lead Applicant, Organization, or Community:	Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation – Dene Lands and Resource Management
Work Plan Identifier Number: <i>If this is an on-going project please fill the identifier number for 20/21 fiscal by adjusting the last four digits: Example: D-1-2020 would become D-1-2022</i>	New project – previously title new project 12-2020
Project Region(s):	Athabasca
Project Start Year: <i>First year funding under the OSM program was received for this project (if applicable)</i>	2022
Project End Year: <i>Last year funding under the OSM program is requested Example: 2022</i>	2025
Total 2022/23 Project Budget: <i>For the 2022/23 fiscal year</i>	\$418,000.00
Requested OSM Program Funding: <i>For the 2022/23 fiscal year</i>	\$400,000.00
Project Type:	Community Based Monitoring
Project Theme:	Surface Water
Anticipated Total Duration of Projects (Core and Focused Study (3 years))	Year 3
Current Year	Focused Study: Choose an item.
	Core Monitoring: Year 1

CONTACT INFORMATION	
Lead Applicant/ Principal Investigator: <i>Every work plan application requires one lead applicant. This lead is accountable for the entire work plan and all deliverables.</i>	Lisa Tssessaze
Job Title:	Director
Organization:	Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation – Dene Lands and Resource Management
Address:	220 Taiganova Crescent, Fort McMurray, AB, T9K 0T4
Phone:	780-697-3730
Email:	Lisa.tssessaze@acfn.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 ACFN CBM program seeks to answer community concerns about potential impacts from oil sands development, provide local employment opportunities, supports cultural transmissions, and provide answers about the state of our traditional territory.

The ACFN employ an Environmental Effects Monitoring approach to track indicators of importance to the community using a series of monitoring triggers. This structured approach allows the ACFN to understand risks to their Treaty Rights by long term monitoring and comparison against the community developed management (Section 35) triggers.

The CBM Program operates in a manner that:

- develops and tracks Indigenous Knowledge indicators pertaining to ACFN rights, culture, and community well-being;
- conducts scientific monitoring of valued ecosystem components (water quality, water quantity, fish health);
- helps community members safely navigate ACFN territory by tracking and marking river channels and hazards, and by measuring changing winter ice and snow conditions;
- creates educational opportunities for youth and Elders to come together;
- supports collaborative research with other CBM initiatives, federal and provincial programs, and academia.

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 the EEM 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 EEM framework 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
- Discuss results of previous monitoring/studies/development and what has been achieved to date.

The Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation's Community Based Monitoring program began in 2010, sampling water quality and water quantity. The CBM program is one of the important ways that ACFN is caring for our lands. Environmental Guardians go out twice weekly year round to collect data that is used by ACFN to take action on issues threatening the health of our lands and water. The program creates meaningful, local employment for our members. It also creates opportunities for Elders and youth to spend time on the land together, which ensures that the future generations will continue to uphold our responsibility to watch over the land.

The CBM program has grown enormously since it began, and has seen some exciting developments in the last 4 years of operation. Since 2016, under direction from Chief and Council, and as directed by the Elders, and with vision from Lisa Tssessaze at the DLRM, the program has expanded and professionalized. Today the program has a full time Manager of Rights and Lands who directs a full time Program Coordinator in Fort Chipewyan with 2 Environmental Guardians.

Key drivers for the ACFN are to better understand the water quality and quantity and health of wild foods that members consume. Elders have noted and intimately described negative changes to the health of the Peace Athabasca Delta and have founded a Community Based Monitoring program to assist in the rigorous collection of both science and Indigenous Knowledge Indicators to track these changes. If possible, the community hopes to identify stressors and help address these changes through management responses or remediation/restoration.

The mandate of the ACFN program aligns well with that of OSM in that it seeks to understand if and how changes are occurring in the traditional homelands and waters of the ACFN, to understand the contributions of the oil sands operations to these changes and to place these changes in the context of cumulative effects, most notably the synergistic effects of hydro regulation and climate change. They do this using Indigenous Indicators alongside western science.

This work builds on a decade of steady capacity and growth. The community based monitoring program has office and storage space at the Youth-Elder lodge. A network of backcountry cabins have also been built to support expanding research. The CBM program also owns 3 skidoos and sleighs, along with a skidoo trailer, and have access to the Youth Elder lodge's boat for some sampling operations and tours.

The team also owns a complete suite of modern scientific sampling devices for a water chemistry sampler, sediment grab sampler, coring equipment (to study contaminants in aged lake cores, and wildlife health dissection gear).

Custom Phone App

The ACFN has co-designed and built Geokeeper, which is a phone app that is used as a custom field collection tool, and trip tracker. The CBM crew use the app to collect and record data on water quality and quantity. The app can also be used by community members to track navigational hazards when out travelling by boat. You can download the Geokeeper app on the Google Play store and istore.

With final updates to Geokeeper completed in 2019, the Geokeeper is part of ACFN's strategy to modernize data collection, protection and access. The final stage that involves data visualization, so that members can have access to all CBM data, is well underway.

2.0 Objectives of the Work Plan

List in point form the Objectives of the 2022/23 work plan below

The ACFN-CBM program aims to:

1. Undertake core CBM monitoring activities (water quality, water quantity, fish health and winter parameters) to answer community concerns about the state of the Peace-Athabasca Delta and Richardson Backcountry;
2. Engage youth and Elders in monitoring in a culturally-meaningful way;
3. Advance data management and reporting strategies to support knowledge mobilization in the community;
4. Strengthen connections with other Indigenous CBM programs in the oil sands region to support knowledge sharing.

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)
- integrate western science with Indigenous Community-Based Monitoring
- addresses the EEM framework 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:

Surface Water

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 2022/23 work planning all Community Based Monitoring Projects are Focused Studies.

Core 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. Are changes occurring in water quality, biological health (e.g., benthos, fish) and/or water quantity/flows, to what degree are changes attributable to oil sands activities, and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

The ACFN-CBM monitoring program monitors for changes in water chemistry and presence of contaminants of concern. The program also monitors water quantity to understand how water withdrawals may be affecting water levels in our traditional territory. We also monitor for fish health to better understand potential impacts to our traditional foods. Lastly we look at winter ice and snow conditions including Indigenous Indicators of change owing to oil sands water withdrawals and potential contaminants.

Water quantity

In 2011 the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation (ACFN) and Mikisew Cree First Nation (MCFN) undertook a joint community-based water monitoring (CBM) program to address gaps in the provincial and federal government's quantitative assessment of the status of water resources within their territories which are centred around the Peace-Athabasca Delta (PAD). Years of declining water levels precipitated action to create the program. The Government of Alberta and upstream industry have displayed a prolonged lack of interest and initiative in quantifying depth changes and their potential linkage to declines in the Athabasca River and Peace River hydrographs.

Upstream industrial water withdrawals on the Athabasca River are of particular concern to ACFN and MCFN in relation to periods of low discharge due to their direct detrimental effect on their traditional-use rights. The CBM program was specifically designed to quantify the temporal and spatial extent to which access is being lost to ACFN and MCFN territories and to determine whether there are identifiable thresholds evident in relation to this loss.

The PAD's water-based transportation network provides access for ACFN and MCFN to their territories to sustain their traditional-use rights. Flow regulation on the Peace River, oilsands water withdrawals from the Athabasca River and the growing effect of climate change have all contributed to a decline in the PAD's hydrologic recharge leading directly to reduced water depths and a loss of navigability, particularly at critical "pinch points" that are shallower locations which are the first to become impassable as water depths decline. The CBM depth data reveal regions of the PAD that behave in characteristic and contrasting ways. Water depth

in the southern PAD fluctuates most closely with the discharge of the Athabasca River. Although the sites along the edge of Lake Mamawi also reflect that discharge, other factors including the effect of the Peace River obscure its role. Water depth at sites located along the southwest edge of Lake Athabasca are the least correlated with daily discharge of the Athabasca River due to wind and deposition, among other factors. The data document extensive losses of traditional use during the five-year monitoring period.

The findings corroborate and extend the AXF concept which was put forth in 2010 to provide a preliminary threshold for maintaining territorial access in relation to the discharge of the Athabasca River at Fort McMurray. It is given support by the overall convergence of water depth evident at various sites (not only those in the southern PAD) as discharge (QFM) declines below about 500-600 m³/s. While factors other than Athabasca River discharge are at play in the convergence, there is a correlation with QFM, suggesting that the AXF successfully isolates the effect of one key factor related to declining water depths in the PAD: the effect of declining flows in the Athabasca River and in particular, the effect of oilsands withdrawals from the Athabasca River during critical periods of traditional use. As QFM inches down below 500 m³/s, there arises a widespread cumulative loss in ability to navigate along these waterways. Below the AXF, oilsands water withdrawals are disproportionately damaging to traditional use than they would be at higher river discharges. Almost one hundred occurrences of water depth below the AXF were documented in the five years of monitoring and many of those measurements represent periods of lost use through critical passageways resulting in sustained lost access to large areas of territory. The findings point to the need to gather additional CBM data during low discharge of the Athabasca River (300-600 m³/s) to further refine the AXF.

Additional study may include examination of the role of the Peace River freshet, any lag effects from previous years, and local effects of wind and sedimentation. The Government of Alberta's Surface Water Quantity Management Framework (SWQMF) currently provides no benefit to Aboriginal navigability yet it recognizes the need to do so. The threshold for action is set far too high to be useful: it requires an effect from oilsands withdrawals of at least 10% in the Aboriginal Navigation Index (ANI) for a management response to be possible. It also assumes a depth requirement of 100 cm rather than the 122 cm determined from empirical research. In addition, the SWQMF does not incorporate the science-based AXF. There is also no hydrometric station downstream of the oilsands disturbances to verify the withdrawal data and confirm the flow rates being delivered to the PAD. A recent example illustrates the discord between the configuration of the SWQMF and the objective of protecting Aboriginal navigability. Although in 2015 the AER recorded the second lowest fall-season average weekly QFM at 394 m³/s and acknowledged that this was associated with "widespread navigation difficulties", AER continued to authorize oilsands operators to withdraw an average throughout the fall season of 4.54 m³/s. AER confirms this arrangement and recognizes that these withdrawals were permitted despite knowledge of widespread limitations being already in place affecting pre-existing ACFN and MCFN rights-holders from exercising their water-based traditional-use rights. AER notes that this practice is well within the thresholds that it has established within the SWQMF which indicates that no management response is required.

The CBM findings dispute the approach to monitoring and management of Aboriginal

navigability taken in the SWQMF and offers solutions to fix it. The correlation between the AXF and loss of access provides a practical management indicator that the SWQMF can incorporate immediately to enable the Government of Alberta to intervene at the appropriate time to protect these traditional land-use rights. This could be achieved by lowering the ANI change threshold required for action and by integrating it in the SWQMF with recognition of the AXF. In addition, the minimum depth required for passage should be corrected and a reliable hydrometric station should be installed upstream of the PAD. Associated decision-making within the SWQMF should be adjusted so that consideration of priority instream Aboriginal rights is more appropriately balanced against the recent rights granted to oilsands operators.

These findings suggest that the SWQMF be modified so that oilsands water withdrawals are reduced in stages as Athabasca River discharge at Fort McMurray approaches the AXF (here revised to be ~500 m³/s) and that oilsands operators take the steps necessary to be able to halt water withdrawals when the Athabasca River discharge drops below the AXF during specific priority periods within the hunting seasons, as identified by ACFN and MCFN. Unfortunately the SWQMF's disregard for Aboriginal navigability in the PAD is a widespread problem within the oilsands region and is not restricted to the GoA's SWQMF. Oilsands mines continue to be proposed for approval based partly on their promise of adhering to the rules of the SWQMF. However, as the CBM study highlights, the SWQMF rules do not protect navigation-related traditional-use rights and thus adherence to it is not a useful criterion for evaluating proposed oilsands mines.

Water Quality

Elders and land users have noted Indigenous Knowledge Indicators (IK Indicators) such as more algae, foamy scum, dirtier water, scum on rim of the tea pots and boats, as well as a stronger smell to the water (MCFN, 2009). ACFN CBM program water quality data, and Parks Canada data (Glozier et al., 2009), show an increase in nutrient levels in the Peace Athabasca Delta over the last 15-30 years. At 5 of the 9 CBM sampling sites recorded, phosphorus levels were above the government guideline of 0.05mg/L (ACFN, 2012). Phosphorus is the main contributor to algae blooms and resultant decreases in water quality. Therefore western science nutrient data indicates that the PAD is becoming more eutrophic, which is consistent with IK interview findings and IK Indicator monitoring.

Methyl mercury levels also increased exponentially with proximity to the upgraders (Kirk et al., 2012). Methyl mercury bioaccumulates in the food chain, and can affect wildfood, especially fish that community members will consume. In fact, health advisories for mercury levels exist for the Athabasca River and recommend that adults refrain from eating large predatory fish more than once per week and that children and women of child-bearing age not eat these fish at all (Jardine, 2003, in McLachlan, 2012). MCFN examines low level mercury and methyl mercury to assist with better cumulative effects understand of mercury, as well as to assist in understanding health risks associated with consumption of wildfoods. Gull and tern eggs (Hebert) have been shown to have elevated mercury levels, high enough to warrant a human health advisory.

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

Changes to water quality, water quantity, and fish health are of great concern to our community. Our Elders report a decrease in water quality that are a health concern and dropping water levels that impact safe navigation. The ACFN-CBM monitoring program seeks to better understand these changes that are a concern to our community.

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

ACFN collects data on a custom app based application known as Geokeeper. All water quality data is available as a .csv file. All data is to be made available for the OSM program data management system. Efforts are to be made with Daneille Beausoleil and Colin Cooke to establish an upload process, data sharing sgreements and QA/QC standard.The

ACFN has already joined with the Gordon Foundation to put CBM water quality data onto Mackenzie DataStream platform. The Mackenzie DataStream is an initiative to have free, water quality data available to the communities across the Mackenzie watershed to better understand how the changes they are experiencing compare across the region.

Morgan Voyageur has presented and participated at two regional database and data management workshops in Yellowknife, hosted by Tides Canada. This has helped to centre ACFN as a leader in regional CBM in data management.

ACFN hopes to get their water quality information uploaded to the data analytics TAC's Kister's platform this fiscal year. This includes work with that TAC to ensure alignment of data templates and QA/QC processes are aligned.

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

Yes;

- CBM specific SOPs have been developed for water quality lab collections.
- CBM has adopted fish monitoring SOPs used by ECCC and AEP, and furtherfore have an Indigenous Knowledge Index, that could be useful in the development of the broader CBM for OSM.
- ACFN-CBM Guardian staff have been trained in SOPs for use of the YSI DSS Proplus meter, and the WTW Multi 3410 Turbidity meter. They also follow protocols for collection of water quality lab samples, as well as in the deployment fo PMDs, as per coordination with the GNWT's CBM program.

Data QA/QC has been standardized.

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

ACFN closely collaborates with the Mikisew Cree First Nation Community Based Monitoring program. We are actively involved in the Oil Sands Monitoring program thorugh the ICBMAC, and seek to work with other monitoring initiatives that are taking place on our traditional territory.

ACFN continues work with the Mikisew Cree and Wetlands TAC expanding benthic invertebrate, water quality and sediment monitoring at 7 specific basins as identified by the ACFN. We consider this strong integration, as the integration is driven by the ACFN, at sites identified by the ACFN, and using methods as refined by the ECCC team.

ACFN holds a workplan to undertake air monitoring in Fort Chipewyan.

ACFN is also fully integrated with the Mikisew Cree, and is integrated with Mark McMaster and Keegan Hicks whitefish work in the Delta.

6. 7.6. Where does the monitoring fit on the conceptual model within the EEM framework for the theme area and relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program theme area? How will this work advance understanding transition towards of the conceptual model EEM framework?

The monitoring is designed as Environmental Effects Monitoring. Triggers have been established for 7 PAD sites for water chemistry and select contaminants. Ongoing monitoring is therefore assessing changes spatially and temporally against these monitoring triggers. Because Elders have described changes to historic water quality, a focus on nutrient enrichment is a priority, as is contaminants associated with the operation of the Oil Sands. Nutrients such as phosphorus and contaminants such as arsenic, cadmium, silver, and mercury have regularly exceeded water quality guidelines. More work is required to harmonize SOPs with the water quality collections.

Under the surface water conceptual model, this workplan addresses the following:

Pressure:

Spills, Weather, and habitat

Stressors:

Nutrients, Inorganic and organic substances, pH and hydrology (pinch points)

Pathways:

Fluvial transport

Responses:

Water quality and fish as well as traditional use

Of the Programmatic conceptual model this workplan will also address:

Valued Components such as Traditional resources and cultural practices and access to land

7. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting?

Yes. All water quality, quantity and fish health data (not IK) is available for use in the SOE reporting. ACFN continues to actively participate at the ICBAMC level to direct appropriate ICBM reporting within the broader SOE process.

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. Are changes occurring in groundwater quality and/or quantity, to what degree are changes attributable to oil sands activities, are changes affecting other ecosystems, and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. 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.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Where does the monitoring fit within the EEM framework and relative to the theme area? How will this work advance transition towards the EEM framework?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Where does the monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area and relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program? How will this work advance understanding of the conceptual model?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting?

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 Wetland - Key Questions

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

1. Are changes occurring in wetlands due to contaminants and hydrological processes, to what degree are changes attributable to oil sands activities, and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Where does the monitoring fit within the EEM framework and relative to the theme area? How will this work advance transition towards the EEM framework?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Where does the monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area and relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program? How will this work advance understanding of the conceptual model?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting?

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. Are changes occurring in air quality, to what degree are changes attributable to oil sands emissions, and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Are changes informing Indigenous key questions and concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Where does the monitoring fit within the EEM framework and relative to the theme area? How will this work advance transition towards the EEM framework?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Where does the monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area and relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program? How will this work advance understanding of the conceptual model?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting? (Answer Box)

Click or tap here to enter text.



3.3.5 Terrestrial Biology Theme

3.3.5.1 Sub Themes:

Choose an item.

3.3.5.2 Terrestrial Biology - Key Questions

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

1. Are changes occurring in terrestrial ecosystems due to contaminants and landscape alteration, to what degree are changes attributable to oil sands activities, and what is the contribution in the context of cumulative effects?

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Where does the monitoring fit within the EEM framework and relative to the theme area? How will this work advance transition towards the EEM framework?

Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Where does the monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area and relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program? How will this work advance understanding of the conceptual model?

Click or tap here to enter text.

8. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting?

Click or tap here to enter text.



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. Where does the monitoring fit within the EEM framework and relative to the theme area? How will this work advance transition towards the EEM framework?

Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Where does the monitoring fit on the conceptual model for the theme area and relative to the conceptual model for the OSM Program? How will this work advance understanding of the conceptual model?

Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Is the work plan contributing to Programmatic State of Environment Reporting?

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 give consideration for the EEM framework and the approved Key Questions.

Data collected through the ACFN-CBM program informs how our Nation engages with the province on policy development. We have used our data to call for stronger regulatory compliance. The monitoring that we have done on water quantity, along with the development and validation of the Aboriginal Extreme Flow has been used to refine the Water Quantity Management Framework under the Lower Athabasca Regional Plan (LARP). We will continue to use our data to inform management, policy, and regulatory compliance.

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

Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation leads this project and involves Elders and land users in all stages, including program design, data collection, and analysis. We have strong alignment with the Mikisew Cree First Nation CBM program as well.

Dene Elders, Knowledge Holders, and elected leadership have been actively involved in guiding the CBM program since its inception. Their involvement is integral to ensuring that the program is grounded in ACFN Dene stewardship values, provides information to support decision-making, and answers to community priorities. These in turn, coupled with the development of monitoring triggers for sampled parameters, will assist the Nation in establishment of management triggers or section 35 triggers, to ensure protection of treaty and aboriginal rights.

A primary objective of this project is to engage Elders, land users and youth in all aspects of the project, therefore capacity building and training are central to the project. Youth have the opportunity to learn from Elders, land-users, and CBM Guardians. ACFN is also a partner in the Community Based Environmental Monitoring training program being delivered by Keyano College in Fort Chipewyan. ACFN-CBM Guardians will be mentors and guest instructors in this course. The project support community capacity development more broadly through providing employment opportunities, and by empowering community members to be active stewards of our traditional territory.

Does this project include an Integrated Community Based Monitoring Component?

Yes

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 can be assessed against a baseline condition. As relevant give consideration for the EEM framework and the approved Key Questions.

The Whitefish camp was designed to collect three years of baseline data (modelled after the OSM core fish monitoring program). The current site was chosen as an areas of high traditional use, and this year (Sept 2020) will be the third year of collections. We are working with Mark McMaster and Keegan Hicks to assess our baseline data for whitefish and create decision triggers for the PAD. Study design involves 20 male and 20 females (based off of year one collections) and is of sufficient power to detect levels of change we have determined significant enough to trigger changes in monitoring frequency and focus. ACFN will examine whitefish to determine how big a change would represent a departure from what we would expect the situation to be for fish health, contaminants, abundance, movement (From McMaster).

1. Abundance. If the dryfish makers, through the index agree that fish numbers decline alongside a CPUE decline. Power for CPUE is low, and therefore designed essentially to catch large changes in fish abundance. CPUE was not calculated in year one pilot, and therefore no trigger currently exists. Essentially any change of 25% outside of the 3-year CPUE mean will trigger the management trigger.
2. The health condition factors and indices (age/ size, sex ration, GSI, LSI, demonstrates a 25% change or mean +/- 2SD after three yrs. For changes to K-value this is based off a 10% change
3. If the contaminant trend (total Hg or pre-selected PACs) exceeds 25% or mean +/- 2SD (whichever is smaller) – established after three yrs of monitoring.
4. Any IK index factors decline by 25% or mean +/- 2SD over a three yr sampling period.

Monitoring triggers have been established for 7 sites in the PAD from water chemistry, based on EEM approaches in partnership with Kelly Munkittrick. Current monitoring therefore is assessing the state of water quality against our 8 year understanding of the natural variation.

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 give consideration for the EEM framework and the approved Key Questions.

For the whitefish camp in the PAD we are primarily looking for stressors from the Athabasca Oil Sands, with the noted caveat that whitefish populations are assumed to be from the Athabasca river, however we cannot yet rule our populations coming from the Peace river or even resident populations. This project design assesses change in fish health indicators within sites, between sites, and between years within two areas with assistance from Mark McMaster and team. Similar methods are used across teams. If effects are documented and not understood, we will then use focused studies to investigate the causes of the observed changes.

The water quality methodology will also add to the transect nature of the OSM core water program, getting better cumulative effects data to answer to gaps in the spatial understanding of the PAD in particular. This will also provide baseline data for areas potentially to be impacted by Teck Frontier should that mine proceed. Work on the Peace River is important to gain a better regional understanding of the various water inputs to the PAD.

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 give consideration for the EEM framework and the approved Key Questions.

The ACFN-CBM program collects data using Standard Operating Procedures and best practices. Staff are well-trained in data collection methods to ensure the quality of data. Data undergoes a rigorous QA/QC procedure. All lab analysis are done by an accredited lab, and we work with consultants to synthesize the data to ensure it is credible.

We are committed to disseminating monitoring data through the OSM program.

Communicating results back to our community members in accessible language is a priority to us. We produce a number of different communication products to share information back to our community members each year (quarterly community newsletters, a wall calendar, summary documents of technical reports). We also attend the Elders Council meeting to share results back to our Elders in person.

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 give consideration for the EEM framework and the approved Key Questions.

This work plan builds off of over 10 years of CBM experience. ACFN has demonstrated leadership in development of OSM Operational Framework Agreement and has been engaged in the Oil Sands Monitoring project for 8 years. MCFN has established relationships with Environment and Climate Change Canada, Government of Alberta, Parks Canada, and University of Alberta. We hope to strengthen these relationships and work towards stronger monitoring integration with these organizations through this work plan

ACFN has coordinated with AEP, ECCC, and other Indigenous groups in a variety of ways include sharing of methods, coordination of analysis, and ensuring that sampling methods are compatible between data sources to ensure efficiencies.

The ACFN-CBM program is highly coordinated with the Mikisew Cree First Nation CBM program. We share methods, protocols, and data. MCFN & ACFN lab analyses are done in coordination to support efficiencies.

- ACFN is continuing a partnership with Keegan Hicks (AEP) and Mark McMaster (ECCC) through the "OSM Monitoring Fish Health and Community" program to study the health of Lake Whitefish through an annual Whitefish Camp. Lab analyses are done in coordination with AEP and ECCC.

ACFN closely collaborates with the Mikisew Cree First Nation Community Based Monitoring program. We are actively involved in the Oil Sands Monitoring program through the ICBMAC, and seek to work with other monitoring initiatives that are taking place on our traditional territory.

ACFN continues work with the Mikisew Cree and Wetlands TAC expanding benthic invertebrate, water quality and sediment monitoring at 7 specific basins as identified by the ACFN. We consider this strong integration, as the integration is driven by the ACFN, at sites identified by the ACFN, and using methods as refined by the ECCC team.

ACFN holds a workplan to undertake air monitoring in Fort Chipewyan

The ACFN Community Based Monitoring Program is highly participatory. Community members are hired as CBM Guardians; Elders and Land Users are engaged in program design as well in the gathering and



interpretation of Indigenous knowledge; youth are involved in CBM on the land camps; and accessible reporting is done to share information with ACFN members.

10.0 Work Plan Approach/Methods

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

Phase 1 – Sample collection and Indigenous Knowledge observations from CBM Guardians

- Undertake water quality, water quantity, fish health and snow and ice monitoring, using Indigenous Knowledge and western science;
- Further develop and refine EEM triggers for all mediums sampled

Phase 2-

- Support the involvement of Elders in all aspects of the CBM program;
- Create further youth-Elder venues for knowledge transfer;
- Work with Delta School and Keyano college to integrate curriculum with OSM deliverables

Phase 3 - Reporting and Information Sharing

- Report back to the community using a variety of different mediums, including in-person events, social media, and various print documents;
- Complete community appropriate data visualization platforms and advertise, and support communication of findings
- Explore integrated reporting opportunities with other regional CBM programs;
- Continue use and development of custom 'GeoKeeper' database, and link with Mackenzie Datastream.

Phase 4 Foster relationships with Oil Sands Region CBM programs.

- Strengthen connections with other Indigenous CBM programs in the oil sands region to support knowledge sharing.
- Support greater TAC integration and IK-WS integration

10.2 Describe how changes in environmental Condition will be assessed *

- Changes in environmental condition will be assessed through a combination of western science and through Indigenous Knowledge. We will look to our elders and land users to describe any changes in the environmental conditions that we see. Our data analysis will be undertaken by the CBM program manager and other scientists.

Monitoring triggers have been established for 7 sites in the PAD for water chemistry, based on EEM approaches in partnership with Kelly Munkittrick. Current monitoring therefore is assessing the state of water quality against our 8 year understanding of the natural variation.

For whitefish the following will be undertaken (three years required for triggers to be established):

1. Abundance. If the dryfish makers, through the index agree that fish numbers decline alongside a CPUE decline. Power for CPUE is low, and therefore designed essentially to catch large changes in fish abundance. CPUE was not calculated in year one pilot, and therefore no trigger currently exists. Essentially any change of 25% outside of the 3-year CPUE mean will trigger the management trigger.
2. The health condition factors and indices (age/ size, sex ration, GSI, LSI, demonstrates a 25% change or mean +/- 2SD after three yrs. For changes to K-value this is based off a 10% change (Tim Arc 2015? Moose river)
3. If the contaminant trend (total Hg or pre-selected PACs) exceeds 25% or mean +/- 2SD (whichever is smaller) – established after three yrs of monitoring.
4. Any IK index factors decline by 25% or mean +/- 2SD over a three year sampling period.

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

- ACFN uses the 'Aboriginal Extreme Flow' policy as a threshold for low water flows in the Peace Athabasca Delta. The AXF represents the threshold at which safe navigation by the boat is impeded in the Delta.

- ACFN uses the CCME Canadian Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life to assess the condition of water quality. ACFN also employs a customized CCME Water Quality Index Calculator, as a means to culturally appropriately demonstrate results to the community, while exploring limitations of the tool for trend analysis.

(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 *

The ACFN and MCFN CBM programs collect complimentary data and share sampling methods:

Water Quality

- The ACFN CBM program samples water chemistry and Indigenous Knowledge indicators weekly during the open water season at 7 sites. At each site information is collected on water temperature, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, pH, salinity, Chlorophyl A. Additionally, weather descriptions are logged and a geographical position is taken. All data is collected on a custom app based database system containing internal quality control features. Monitoring staff employ a YSI Pro Plus meter, and a Analite NEP 160 Turbidity meter or a WTW Multi 3410 Turbidity meter. The Mikisew Cree collects complimentary data at an additional 7 sites in the PAD.

Water Quantity

ACFN Guardians measure depth at nine sites. At each site, ten depth readings are evenly distributed across each cross-section of a channel. This method accounts for variability of the bed and provides options for analysis of regional correlations.

Snow & Ice- Samples are taken at seven different sites. Snow depth, ice depth, Indigenous Knowledge indicators of ice quality and water chemistry are monitoring at each site. Data is used to track changing conditions related to climate change and development and also provide valuable information to the community about winter travel safety.

Indigenous Knowledge Methods- Indigenous knowledge has informed the design of ACFN CBM program, and is woven into all aspects of its implementation. The ACFN CBM program goals and site selection were established after extensive consultations and interviews with ACFN Elders. Elders guide training and are continuously part of monitoring, training and evaluation of the program.

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

Western Science Indicators - Routine, pH, Conductivity, Alkalinity, All Anions, Total Nitrate (NO₂) + Nitrate (NO₃), All Cations, Hardness, Nitrogen: Total, Dissolved, Turbidity, TSS, TDS, Ammonia, Phosphorus: Total, Dissolved, Ortho, Carbon: Total and Dissolved, Metals (Al, As, Ba, Be, Cd, Cr, Cu, Cn, Fe, Pb, Li, Mn, Hg spectated, Mo, Ni, Se, Ag, V, Zn).

Channel depth is currently used as a measure of water quantity - Ice thickness, Snow depth

Indigenous knowledge Indicators - The CBM program tracks changes to the PAD using Indigenous Knowledge indicators identified by ACFN Elders. Indigenous Knowledge indicators are monitored weekly and evaluated alongside scientific monitoring results to look for synergies. This co-production of knowledge allows us to fill out the story explaining changes to the PAD more fully and to explain changes back to community members in a culturally appropriate format.

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.

The ACFN-CBM Knowledge Transfer Plan includes the dissemination of results to technical audiences as well as our community members.

Technical Audiences:

An Annual Progress Report will be written which includes a technical summary of findings from both Western Science and Indigenous Knowledge components of the project. A plain language summary will also be developed to share with ACFN leadership.

Community Members:

Four Quarterly Community Newsletters will be developed, which provide updates on the program, stories from the field, and plain language summary of data analysis from monitoring season.

A joint MCFN-ACFN CBM wall calendar will be produced that shares information from the CBM program, and provides an opportunity for community members to track their observations of changes on the land.

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

Bruce Maclean – Principal, Maclean Environmental Consulting

Bruce supports the ACFN-CBM program in program design & implementation, data analysis, reporting.

Taiga Environmental Laboratory – Taiga Environmental Laboratory is a full-service analytical laboratory that performs a wide range of organic and inorganic chemical analyses on surface water. It is accredited by the Canadian Association for Laboratory Accreditation (CALA) to ISO/IEC 17025 standards and accreditation is limited to the tests named on the scope of testing.

*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:

Discrete

13.3 Frequency of Collection:

Monthly

13.4 Estimated Data Collection Start Date:

2022-04-01

13.5 Estimated Data Collection End Date:

2025-03-31

13.6 Estimated Timeline For Upload Start Date:

2022-04-30

13.7 Estimated Timeline For Upload End Date:

2025-03-31

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

YES

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
ACFN_WaterQuality	ACFN Internal Database	.csv	Open by Default
ACFN_WaterQuantity	ACFN Internal Database	.csv	Open by Default
ACFN_IKIndicators	ACFN Internal Database	.csv	Protected by Default

14.0 2022/23 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	Technical analysis of CBM results
OSM Program Annual Progress Report (required)	Q4	OSM Program Annual Progress Report
Public Dissemination Document	Q1	Spring Community Newsletter - Joint newsletter with MCFN. Includes updates on the program, stories from the field, and plain language summary of data analysis from monitoring season.
Public Dissemination Document	Q2	Summer Community Newsletter - Joint newsletter with MCFN. Includes updates on the program, stories from the field, and plain language summary of data analysis from monitoring season.
Public Dissemination Document	Q3	Fall Community Newsletter - Joint newsletter with MCFN. Includes updates on the program, stories from the field, and plain language summary of data analysis from monitoring season.
Public Dissemination Document	Q4	Winter Community Newsletter - Joint newsletter with MCFN. Includes updates on the program, stories from the field, and plain language summary of data analysis from monitoring season.
Stakeholder or Community Presentation	Q2	Meeting with Elder Council to share results, seek input, answer questions

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.

ACFN has a strong CBM team with a proven track record of quality data collection. The Guardians are skilled-professionals with a mix of on-the-land experience and formal monitoring training. They possess all required safety certifications. The Guardian team is supported by strong administration and leadership support. There are no anticipated personnel or expertise gaps.

The program is managed by the ACFN-Dene Lands and Resource Management, who receives direction from Chief and Council.

1. Lisa Tsessaze – Director of ACFN Dene Lands and Resource Management
Role: Oversees CBM Program. She holds a degree in Environmental Sciences from the University of Alberta and has been working for the DLRM since 2004.
2. Lori Cyprien – Rights and Lands Manager, ACFN Dene Lands and Resource Management. She holds a diploma in Renewable Resources from NAIT, a degree in Natural Resource Science from Thompson Rivers University, and a MSc in Environment and Management from Royal Roads University. Managing the Rights and Lands team, Lori oversees ACFN's Reserve Lands, Traditional Lands, Community-Based Monitoring (CBM) Program, Guardian Program and various research programs.
3. Morgan Voyageur – CBM Guardian Coordinator. Morgan began in 2018 as the full time CBM Co-ordinator, after 4 years as the lead field Environmental Guardian, and is now based out of the Youth-Elders Lodge. Morgan is responsible for conducting all sampling and field collections, coordination of Elder and youth engagement, as well as data quality control and special projects.
4. John Cardinal – CBM Guardian is one of two senior CBM field Environmental Guardians. John works diligently at watching over the Dene lands and waters since 2011. In addition to conducting ACFN's weekly sampling, he often works with guest researchers on special projects such as gull and tern egg collections, snow sampling and channel morphology studies.
5. Chas Marcel -CBM Guardian. Holds a Certificate in Community Based Environmental Monitoring through Keyano College.



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
Drevnick, Paul	AEP Lab coordination	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 <i>(Calculated from Table 16.1.1 above)</i>	0.00%	\$0.00
Operations and Maintenance		
Consumable materials and supplies		\$32560.00
Conferences and meetings travel		\$0.00
Project-related travel		\$0.00
Engagement		\$0.00
Reporting		\$0.00
Overhead		\$0.00
Total All Grants <i>(Calculated from Table 16.4 below)</i>		\$0.00
Total All Contracts <i>(Calculated from Table 16.5 below)</i>		\$0.00
Sub- TOTAL <i>(Calculated)</i>		\$0.00
Capital*		\$0.00
AEP TOTAL <i>(Calculated)</i>		\$0.00

* 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 <i>(Please manually provide the number in the space below)</i>		
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 <i>(Calculated)</i>		\$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	Lisa Tsessaze- Director, ACFN Dene Lands and Resource Management
GRANT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation – Dene Lands and Resource Management
Category	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits	\$200000.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies	\$50000.00
Conferences and meetings travel	\$2500.00
Project-related travel	\$37500.00
Engagement	\$25000.00
Reporting	\$45000.00
Overhead	\$40000.00
GRANT TOTAL <i>(Calculated)</i>	\$0.00

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 <i>(Calculated)</i>	\$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 <i>Sums totals for salaries and benefits from AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Project-related travel <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Engagement <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Reporting <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Overhead <i>Sums totals for AEP and ECCC ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Total All Grants (from table 16.2.1 above) <i>Sums totals for AEP Tables ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Total All Contracts (from table 16.2.1 above) <i>Sums totals for AEP Tables ONLY</i>	\$0.00
Sub- TOTAL	\$0.00
Capital* <i>Sums total for AEP</i>	\$0.00
GRAND PROJECT TOTAL	\$0.00

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.

This is a continuing project, that received funding the last 3 fiscal years. In 2019-2020 and 2020-21 ACFN met all project deliverables and was in the current fiscal is projected to complete deliverables on time and on budget.

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)
ACFN Management time	Lisa Tssessaze – director ACFN - DLRM	\$18,000.00
TOTAL		\$0.00



19.0 Consent & Declaration of Completion

Lead Applicant Name

Lisa Tsessaze

Title/Organization

Director, Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation – Dene Lands and Resource Management

Signature

Lisa Tsessaze

Date

2021-09-30

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.