

Work Plan Application

Project Information	
Project Title:	Fort McKay Métis Community-Based Wetland Monitoring
Lead Applicant, Organization, or Community:	Fort McKay Métis Nation
Work Plan Identifier Number: If this is an on-going project please fill the identifier number for 24/25 fiscal by adjusting the last four digits: Example: D-1-2425 would become D-1-2425	N/A
Project Region(s):	Athabasca
Project Start Year: First year funding under the OSM program was received for this project (if applicable)	2020
Project End Year: Last year funding under the OSM program is requested Example: 2024	Intended to be a long-term monitoring project
Total 2024/25 Project Budget: From all sources for the 2024/25 fiscal year	\$393,600.00
Requested OSM Program Funding: For the 2024/25 fiscal year	\$393,600.00
Project Type:	Long Term Monitoring
Project Theme:	Wetlands
Anticipated Total Duration of Projects (Core and Focused Study (3 years))	Year 5
Current Year (choose one):	Focused Study -Select One-
	Core Monitoring -Select One-

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.	Margaret Luker
Job Title:	Agreement Relations Manager
Organization:	Fort McKay Métis Nation
Address:	Box 119, Riverstone PO, Fort McMurray, AB. T9K 2Y4
Phone:	780-881-3924
Email:	mluker@fortmckaymetis.com

Project Summary

In the space below, please provide a summary 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 and **should not exceed 300 words**.

Fort McKay Métis community members have raised concerns about the cumulative impacts industrial development is having on regional wetlands and the effects on traditional livelihoods and culture. In 2019, Fort McKay Métis successfully implemented a community-based wetland monitoring program relating to two wetlands near McClelland Lake. From 2020 to 2023, Fort McKay Métis received funding through OSM to expand the program and completed monitoring at new locations including one wetland at Island Lake and 3 wetlands in the McKay River watershed. Fort McKay Métis are now applying for funding under OSM to continue community-based wetland monitoring at all these sites to include a total of 6 wetlands.

Fort McKay Métis identified key objectives for community-based monitoring: 1) the use of both western science and Indigenous knowledge to measure indicators related to wetlands and understand change; 2) generate information that helps answer questions from the community; 3) build community capacity for environmental and social monitoring; 4) create meaningful employment opportunities for community members; and 5) create opportunities for youth and elders/land users to work and spend time together on the land to support knowledge transfer and cultural sustainability.

These objectives are aligned with the goals in the ICBM Integration Strategy and Implementation Plan and the Indigenous Community Based Monitoring Program Framework and will answer the following key community questions:

- Are wetlands drying out? Why?
- Are there fewer healthy wetlands that can be used for the traditional harvesting of plants and berries? Why?
- Are there fewer animals using wetland areas? Why?
- Is it getting harder to predict how to travel through wetlands and muskeg areas? Why?

The western science data collection will integrate methods used by the core Oil Sands Monitoring Wetland Technical Advisory Committee where possible to ensure the data is suitable for regional analysis.

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.

Fort McKay Métis is building a regional community-based monitoring program that tracks changes in wetlands that are of key importance to them, as well as regionally important. Ultimately, Fort McKay Métis would like to carry out a community-driven, community-based monitoring program using a complementary set of biological and socio-cultural indicators at all important wetlands within their territory. They hope information generated through this type of program will help inform decision making related to land use and development planning within their traditional harvesting area. Many of the wetlands previously monitored within the Fort McKay Métis Harvesting Area were monitored for western science indicators and questions related to industrial development. These programs have not been specifically designed to answer community questions and they have not integrated Indigenous knowledge or cultural values in their designs. This monitoring project addresses the Surveillance section of the OSM Key Questions under the Wetlands column identifying how the wetland ecosystems have changed from baseline. We will integrate adaptive monitoring to address the knowledge gap of missing indigenous knowledge in surveillance of wetland ecosystems. This project fits the source-pathway-receptor of the OSM programmatic conceptual model where pressures are land disturbance, industrial water use, and oil sand production. Stressors are increased access, elimination of streams, wetlands and lakes, surface water diversions/withdrawals and contaminants. Pathways include changes to groundwater levels and water quality , surface water quality, invasive species, and wildlife harvesting.

Our project's linkages to adaptive monitoring include: • Holding annual community meetings to review indicators and identify changes required to continue meeting the monitoring objectives; • Centralizing data within Fort McKay's data system; and • Collaborating with the Wetland Technical Advisory Committee (Wetland TAC) by sharing data and information and using consistent protocols. The community is using traditional knowledge and a long history of time spent on the land to make decisions about the monitoring activities which makes them uniquely qualified to help the monitoring program evolve.

The Fort McKay Métis community-based wetland monitoring program will answer specific questions being asked by the community, use Indigenous knowledge in all phases of the monitoring program, and use western science tools and methods that allow seamless integration with other OSM monitoring activities. The program will establish existing conditions at wetlands important to the community, collect scientific and socio-cultural data, build capacity for environmental monitoring within the community, and promote knowledge transfer between elders and youth. This monitoring program meets the mandate of the OSM program by tracking and reporting on changes in wetlands in the oil sands region and whether these changes can be attributed to oil sands activity. Our project fits within the Wetland TAC scope of work document under their section "Theme Area Work Planning: Monitoring Approach for 2024-25, Core Program Components/Key Methods" where they state that the wetland work will build on indigenous community-based monitoring from Fort McKay Métis Nation. Our project team communicates regularly with Danielle Cobbaert and Stephanie Connor to stay updated on the newest Wetland TAC protocols and site locations. The Fort McKay Métis successfully established a pilot community-based wetland monitoring program at McClelland Lake in 2019 that continued for five years with Environment and Climate Change Canada funding. The community also completed four years of the OSM monitoring program at Island Lake (2020-2023) and three years of monitoring at two to three sites in the McKay River watershed (2021-2023). During this time the program has created opportunities for elders, land users, and younger community

members to connect and share their knowledge of the land. Brandon Paquette, a Fort McKay Métis community member, created the first draft of an identification book for plants important to the community. This book incorporates indigenous knowledge and was created by sourcing knowledge from elders in the community. Through continued funding, monitoring will build on the success and efficiencies of the current program.

2.0 Objectives of the Work Plan

List in point form the objectives of the 2024/25 work plan below

- Continue an integrated, community-based monitoring program at six wetlands, two near McClelland Lake, one near Island Lake, and three in the McKay River watershed, that includes both Indigenous knowledge and western science to measure indicators related to wetlands.
- Answer key questions from the community and generate information that contributes to the knowledge of environmental impacts from oil sands development by integrating monitoring protocols and data management.
- Continue to build community capacity for data collection, reporting, and evaluation through training and mentorship.

This work plan falls under the Indigenous Community Based Monitoring Advisory Committee. The Wetlands Theme is the most relevant for this long-term independent study, as all indicator data will be collected within wetlands.

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 Theme

Please select the theme(s) your monitoring work plan relates to:

- Air Groundwater Surface Water Wetlands
- Terrestrial Biology Data Management Analytics & Prediction Cross Cutting

3.2 Core Monitoring, Focused Study or Community Based Monitoring

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.

Community Based Monitoring

Themes

Please select the theme from the options below. Select all that apply.

- Air Groundwater Surface Water Wetland
- Terrestrial Cross-Cutting

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 monitoring program will inform management, policy, and regulatory compliance by documenting changes in wetland indicators using Indigenous knowledge and scientific methods and making recommendations for adaptive management whenever possible. If current industrial development in the area is in environmental compliance yet wetland changes are documented then it will inform policy makers that current legislation is not sufficient for the desired outcome. This project will also document information about the valued components of wetlands that Fort McKay Métis traditionally use which will inform policy makers when assessing gaps in current regulatory processes.

The project aligns with the Strategic Direction of the Lower Athabasca Regional Plan of “Inclusion of Aboriginal Peoples in Land-Use Planning” that intend to collect traditional ecological knowledge to inform land and natural resource planning in the region. Additionally, the information collected will inform Fort McKay Métis decision-making on continued traditional use and access.

Adaptive monitoring will include community input to determine needed changes in the long-term project monitoring. This relates to the key question under wetland surveillance of endpoint relating to indigenous concerns. The community has expressed concern of disturbance, contaminant and wildlife in the wetland sites and continued indigenous participation will ensure all monitoring is adapted to their needs.

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

This program is led by Fort McKay Métis in collaboration with Associated Environmental Consultants Inc., the Human Environment Group Ltd., and the Integral Ecology Group. The first four years of this mainly OSM-funded project with the same collaborators was proven successful from 2020-2023. Our monitoring activities are initiated by the Fort McKay Métis community and inform questions posed by the community relating to regional wetland health. The data are collected by the community relating to socio-cultural and western science indicators at locations chosen or confirmed at a community meeting each year. The indicators will answer questions relating to overall wetland health, traditional use and harvesting, water quality, and shallow groundwater levels. This project will build community capacity for future environmental monitoring. All research questions and indicators are approved by Fort McKay Métis collaboratively during project development and any comments or concerns are addressed at a community meeting prior to each year of monitoring to ensure full consent is received. Monitoring activities may be staged from a camp (if public health restrictions and the site allow) where elders, land users, and community monitors will work together throughout all aspects of the program. All program activities are

structured to facilitate the transfer of knowledge, skills, and values among participants.

Does this project include an Integrated Community Based Monitoring Component?

No

If YES, please complete the [ICBM Abbreviated Work Plan Forms](#) and submit using the link below

[ICBM WORK PLAN SUBMISSION LINK](#)

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

Are there any community specific protocols that will be followed?

Yes, informal community protocols for respectful data collection on traditional lands will be followed.

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.

Although this project is led by the Fort McKay Métis community, there are still considerations made for respectful data collection. This project was created to answer questions from the Fort McKay community in a collaborative way by collecting and analyzing traditional knowledge and western science data.

Traditional knowledge: Indigenous participants from Fort McKay share traditional knowledge and stories of the land including the history of how the land was shaped and the history of land users. This information is collected through informal interviews where formal consent is received prior to information being collected. Data collection methods are reviewed to ensure the knowledge holder can consent to them (i.e., collecting notes, voice recording, photos, videos). Fort McKay Metis have standard consent forms that are signed before interviews or data collection begins.

Western science: Indigenous participants from Fort McKay are involved with the site selection, access route planning, and data collection. Any changes to western science methods are reviewed with the community prior to their use to ensure they are still in the best interest of the community. For example, samples and biomass removed from the land are limited to what is necessary for the intent of the data.

Reports and deliverables are reviewed by the community prior to being shared to ensure the data and photos are consistent with the consent provided. Risks and harms were assessed prior to the start of this wetland monitoring project. The community staff that are actively involved in the program, and our team (some who have worked for decades with community of Fort McKay) understand the potential for risks and harms that are present. The collaboration with key community members, the Human Environment Group, the Integral Ecology Group, and open communication has mitigated these risks and harms. This is ultimately a community driven project.

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.

The project involves collecting, sharing, interpreting, and applying indigenous knowledge; and it aligns with the Interim Ethical Guidelines as explained below.

1. Respectful Relationships are the Foundation of Collaboration

Community members have been an integral part of the team conceptualizing, designing and implementing the community based wetland program. Community members have:

- Defined program objectives
- Identified monitoring questions
- Selected Indicators for monitoring effects to wetlands
- Made recommendations for monitoring locations
- Participated in field program
- Review reports, contribute photos, own, store and control program data

2. Indigenous and Western Science Knowledge Systems are Valid and Complementary

This project values both indigenous and western science knowledge systems and they each form a valued portion of the project and complement each other. This is reflected in the annual reports that present monitoring results from both knowledge systems on equal footing.

3. Working with Multiple Knowledge Systems Requires an Interdisciplinary Approach

An interdisciplinary approach has been implemented for this project. This includes selecting a diverse team, including community members, social scientists, and wetland scientists to collect and report on

information from multiple knowledge systems. We are aware of gaps in skills and training and have been working to support the community in closing these gaps.

4. Meaningful and Equitable Community Participation is Essential

The community is not just participating in the project, they are leading the project. The project includes community members of all ages and genders that are interested in contributing.

5. Risks and Harms are Assessed from Indigenous and Western Science Perspectives and Local Experiences
Since the community directs the project, there are no issues with creating space for indigenous knowledge holders. The project was set up in a way that the identification of indicators was not rushed, and the pace of the monitoring activities does not erode trust or relationships.

6. Opportunities and Benefits are Informed by Community Needs and Interests

Results are shared through posters, skills are shared between community members throughout the project, community knowledge holders are recognized during the project and in deliverables, and methods used for community engagement are included in the final reporting.

7. Prior Informed Consent is an Ongoing Process and Commitment

Fort McKay Métis Consent Forms are signed by each participant at the beginning of the field season, before information collection begins. These forms are stored with project information in Community Knowledge Keeper. Community members are aware of the full scope of the project and where their information is included. Draft reports and posters are reviewed with participants to ensure they are happy with the way information is presented, including quotes, and photographs. Consent is never assumed and is an ongoing process.

8. Indigenous Knowledge is Shared Through Culturally Appropriate Processes

Indigenous knowledge and the format for collecting and sharing it is discussed with the knowledge holder. Collecting indigenous knowledge is not rushed or completed in a rigid manner, limits of sharing are respected, and knowledge holders are appropriately recognized for their contributions.

9. Indigenous Knowledge Requires Specific Protections from Misrepresentation, Misuse and Misappropriation

Indigenous knowledge is carefully collected and reported to preserve the original intent of the information. The community owns these data after collection.

10. Indigenous Communities are the Owners and Stewards of Community-Based Monitoring Data and Information

The plan for collecting and sharing data was discussed early in OSM planning. The community drives this project and is in control of where and when data is shared and reported. Fort McKay Métis own all data.

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

The Fort McKay Métis community leads this project and any data collected and interpreted is completed by community members and results are reviewed by the community prior to submission. Explicit consent for any traditional knowledge included in reporting and how it is included is key to the success of the project.

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

The Fort McKay Métis community holds a meeting before beginning the project each year where the project as a whole is discussed and any concerns can be voiced. Additionally, the project involves many site visits where community members can voice concerns at any time and changes can be made accordingly. The indicators were selected by the community members prior to the start of this wetland monitoring project.

How does this work plan directly benefit Indigenous communities? How does it support building capacity in Indigenous communities?

This work plan directly benefits the Fort McKay Métis community by fulfilling the five key objectives of the project:

- 1) the use of both western science and Indigenous knowledge to measure indicators related to wetlands and understand change;
- 2) generate information that helps answer questions from the community;

- 3) build community capacity for environmental and social monitoring;
- 4) create meaningful employment opportunities for community members; and
- 5) create opportunities for youth and elders/land users to work together to support knowledge transfer and cultural sustainability.

Community members have built capacity to select wetland monitoring sites, assist in planning site visits, data collection, and compiling data into formats that are meaningful to the community, such as a plant book.

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

Information from this work plan will be reported back to the Fort McKay community in a similar way to previous years. This includes a report containing all data and OSM program reporting requirements as well as posters that summarize data from each site and the project as a whole. The posters are printed and displayed in a public area of the community and contain text as well as photos and graphics to make the data accessible.

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.

Changes to wetlands will be assessed using the indicators for the following wetland values: vegetation and lichen community composition and plant harvesting, ground water quality, ground water levels, surface water quality, invertebrate communities, sediment quality in shallow open water wetlands, access to cultural sites and traditional harvesting areas, wildlife and wildlife harvesting, cultural transmission of skills and knowledge.

Changes in environmental condition will be assessed by comparing results to historical conditions whenever possible using Indigenous knowledge or previous data collected through other studies in the area. Where no data is available (such as Island Lake), the first year of monitoring will be used as baseline conditions for comparison in future years. The monitoring program will be adapted based on key concerns of the indigenous community yearly to achieve their desired outcomes.

Our project fits within the Wetland TAC scope of work document under the section “Theme Area Work Planning: Monitoring Approach for 2024-25, Core Program Components/Key Methods” which states that the wetland work will build on work completed by indigenous community-based monitoring from Fort McKay Métis Nation. Our project team communicates regularly with Wetland TAC members to stay updated on the newest Wetland TAC protocols and site locations.

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.

This monitoring will use methods and materials aligned with core monitoring programs in the wetland Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which will allow the data to contribute to regional monitoring. The sub-regional scale will be at a wetland level and will monitor ground water levels, ground water quality, surface water quality including sediments and invertebrates, vegetation, lichens, and wildlife which will be analyzed for the many interactions that may be causing the conditions.

Our project fits within the Wetland TAC scope of work document under the section “Theme Area Work Planning: Monitoring Approach for 2024-25, Core Program Components/Key Methods” which states that the wetland work will build on work completed by indigenous community-based monitoring from Fort McKay Métis Nation. Our project team communicates regularly with Wetland TAC members to stay updated on the

newest Wetland TAC protocols and site locations.

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.

This monitoring program will be a collaboration between the Fort McKay Métis community, Associated Environmental Consultants Inc., and the Human Environment Group to collect data with consistent formats and methods as found within the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) core monitoring programs. This will result in the western science data produced in a useful format that can be shared with the interested TACs. The Fort McKay Métis community led the first three years of this OSM project in 2020-2022 and the results were summarized in a year end report and on posters that could be easily shared with community members at the harvest camp and in common spaces. All future data will be summarized in the same way. The same collaborators also completed a four-year pilot project (2019-2022) through Environment and Climate Change Canada where a report was produced each year containing all locations, methods, results, and data sheets, along with a set of posters. The posters were successful in engaging community members, for example at the fall harvesting festival in 2019, demonstrating their effectiveness for this audience. For each year of monitoring, a similar report containing the results and datasheets will be completed and a set of posters created, to document progress each year for the OSM program.

Our project fits within the Wetland TAC scope of work document under the section “Theme Area Work Planning: Monitoring Approach for 2024-25, Core Program Components/Key Methods” which states that the wetland work will build on indigenous community-based monitoring from Fort McKay Métis Nation. Our project team communicates regularly with Wetland TAC members including key scientists involved in development and implementation of relevant OSM protocols, to stay updated on the current protocols and site locations.

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.

The monitoring integrates methods from the core programs under the Wetland Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) while incorporating Indigenous knowledge in a community-based program. Results will be shared with the relevant TACs and monitoring design avoids existing monitoring locations to avoid duplication. This project is entirely community-based with the Fort McKay Métis community and integrates western science with Indigenous knowledge to monitor for changes in wetland health.

Efficiency was gained by beginning this project through funding from Environment and Climate Change

Canada and using the same project team members. Standardized and consistent methods year to year maintain this efficiency. The sites from the pilot will be included in the 2024 OSM Monitoring programs. The work done through ECCC funding will ensure great efficiencies in setting up OSM monitoring at these sites.

Our project fits within the Wetland TAC scope of work document under their section “Theme Area Work Planning: Monitoring Approach for 2024-25, Core Program Components/Key Methods” where they state that the wetland work will build on indigenous community-based monitoring from Fort McKay Métis Nation. Our project team communicates regularly with Wetland TAC members to stay updated on the newest Wetland TAC protocols and site locations.

10.0 Work Plan Approach/Methods

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

Phase 1: Develop a list of questions and concerns from the Fort McKay Métis community relating to wetland health.

Status: COMPLETED September 2018 (Fort McKay Métis Sustainability Centre 2018).

- Compile a document that lists Fort McKay Metis concerns, traditional use, and knowledge relating to wetlands in the region.

Phase 2: Complete a pilot community-based wetland monitoring project in one wetland complex.

Status: COMPLETED 2019 to 2023 funded by Environment and Climate Change Canada (Associated Environmental Consultants Inc. & Human Environment Group 2019).

- Choose one important wetland complex (McClelland Lake Wetland Complex) with the community for the pilot project
- Develop a list of wetland indicators with the community
- Train community members for wetland monitoring
- Complete field work at three locations within the wetland complex
- Compile data and report on the results
- Validate report and recommendations with community members

Phase 3: Expand the wetland monitoring pilot project into a comprehensive wetland monitoring program

Status: COMPLETED in 2020 through OSM year 1 funding

- Meet with the Fort McKay Metis community to select a new monitoring site from the existing list of priority areas and confirm access, coordinate monitoring program participants, and review methods.
- Review existing data from nearby environmental monitoring programs.
- Continue working with community members who participated in the 2019 pilot project and train additional community members to support monitoring activities.
- Expand indicators used in the 2019 pilot project and modify western science data collection to incorporate methods used by the Oil Sands Monitoring program Wetland Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Surface Water TAC.
- Collect field data using western science and Indigenous knowledge at Island Lake during one annual visit.

Phase 4: Continue field data collection in the wetland complex, analyze data, and report on results for additional years.

Status: IN PROGRESS, started in 2021, continue through 2024 and beyond with OSM funding.

- Continue monitoring at the site near Island Lake by conducting one site visit to collect data on vegetation, groundwater quality, wildlife, and shallow groundwater levels.
- Continue monitoring at the three sites in the McKay River watershed (two added in 2021, one in 2022) by conducting three site visits for monitoring vegetation, groundwater quality, wildlife, and shallow groundwater levels. Visit 1 will be used to deploy groundwater data level loggers in spring, visit three will be used to collect the groundwater data level loggers in the fall. The second site visit will collect all other data in the middle of the growing season.
- Incorporate community-based wetland monitoring (previously funded by ECCC) at McClelland Lake into OSM program and collect data on vegetation, groundwater quality, wildlife, water levels, water quality, invertebrates and sediment in shallow open water habitat.
- Report on results

Describe how changes in environmental Condition will be assessed

Changes to wetland condition will be assessed using the following indicators: vegetation community composition, lichens, invertebrates and sediments in shallow open water wetlands, water quality, groundwater levels, access and traditional use and cultural activities.

Changes in environmental condition will be determined by comparing results to historical data (including Indigenous knowledge), and previous data collected through other studies in the area. Where no data is available, the first year of monitoring will be used as existing conditions for comparison in future years. The results will be used to answer the community's questions related to changes in wetland condition in the vicinity of industrial oil sands development and expansion.

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

Shallow ground water quality data will be compared to Alberta Environment and Parks Environmental Quality Guidelines for Alberta Surface Waters (AEP 2018), since the samples are collected close to the ground surface and are likely influenced by surface water. Surface water and sediment samples collected will also be compared to Alberta Environment and Protected Areas Environmental Quality Guidelines for Alberta Surface Waters (AEP 2018). Regional reference conditions established in literature are also used as a benchmark for isotope samples.

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

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

PHASE 1 (COMPLETE): Develop a list of questions and concerns from the Fort McKay Métis community relating to wetland health through a literature review/search of community database, community meetings to identify wetlands of concern, record wetland questions and concerns, and reporting

PHASE 2 (COMPLETE): Complete a pilot community-based wetland monitoring project in one wetland complex by having a community meeting to develop a list of wetland indicators and choose a monitoring location, developing a monitoring plan and prepare for the field assessment, training community members in the field to collect the required data. Field data collection includes:

oVegetation: dominant woody vegetation in 10 m diameter circular plot and in 1 m square quadrats for herbaceous species along a 30 m transect at three locations.

o Hydrology: depth to water table was recorded at vegetation transect locations using shallow groundwater monitoring wells.

o Water quality: water in the wetland was measured for dissolved oxygen, pH, conductivity, visual qualities (e.g., colour, odour, surface residue, and transparency), and samples were sent to a lab for analysis of additional parameters.

o Cultural use: (harvesting, access, habitation, interactions with industry and non-indigenous users). Indigenous knowledge exchange from elders to family and community members was audio recorded and recorded on datasheets.

Phase 2 also includes reporting to Environment and Climate Change Canada to summarize the program methods and discuss results, and validation of the reporting and program recommendations with community members at a harvest camp.

PHASE 3 (COMPLETE): Expand the wetland monitoring pilot project to include a new site in a different, important wetland area. Methods:

- Meet with the Fort McKay Metis community to choose a site important to the community, consider access routes, coordinate monitoring teams, and confirm methods. Island Lake was chosen.

- Review any existing data from nearby environmental monitoring programs to ensure efforts are not duplicated.

- Continue working with community members who participated in the 2019 ECCC pilot project and train additional community members to support monitoring activities.

- Expand indicators used in the 2019 pilot project and modify western science data collection to incorporate methods used by the Oil Sands Monitoring program Wetland Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Surface Water TAC.

- Collect data on vegetation percent cover by species along transects, incidental wildlife observations, surface water quality, benthic macroinvertebrates, depth to water table using shallow groundwater

monitoring wells, and cultural use and Indigenous knowledge (harvesting, water use, access, interactions with industry or non-indigenous users)

PHASE 4 (STARTED IN 2021, PLANNED TO CONTINUE IN 2024 AND BEYOND USING OSM FUNDING)

Continue field data collection in the wetland complexes, analyze data, and report on results. Methods:

- Hold a community meeting to confirm access routes, a monitoring team, and methods.
- Review any existing data from nearby environmental monitoring programs to ensure efforts are not duplicated.
- Continue monitoring at one site near Island Lake by conducting one site visit for data collection on vegetation, groundwater quality, wildlife, and shallow groundwater levels.
- Continue monitoring at three sites in the McKay River watershed (two added in 2021, one in 2022) by conducting three site visits for monitoring vegetation, groundwater quality, wildlife, and shallow groundwater levels. Visit 1 will be used to deploy groundwater data level loggers in spring, visit three will be used to collect the groundwater data level loggers in the fall. The second site visit will collect all other data in the middle of the growing season.
- Continue monitoring McClelland Lake, which was started in 2019 with ECCC funding, by conducting a site visit to monitor vegetation, lichens, surface water quality, invertebrates, sediments, and wildlife.
- Report on results.

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

- Vegetation percent cover by species
- Lichen species
- Hydrology (shallow groundwater levels)
- Wildlife observations
- Groundwater quality
- Surface water quality in shallow open water wetlands
- Invertebrates in shallow open water wetlands
- Sediment in shallow open water wetlands
- Socio-cultural indicators describing community member's experiences relating to each of the above indicators as well as access and interactions with industry or non-indigenous land users

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 methods, results, and datasheets will be included in a report completed after each year of monitoring. The end-users of the monitoring program are the Fort McKay Métis community who have reports documenting their concerns relating to wetlands and a pilot project documenting wetland health. These annual reports will add to their collection of data documenting change on their land. The results will also be presented in poster format at an annual harvest camp where the community can discuss the results and provide feedback for future monitoring.

The monitoring program was presented at the SETAC North America conference in Fall 2022 to share learnings of the project. Additionally, the plant book created by Brandon Paquette will be used throughout the community as a resource for identifying traditional names and uses of various common plants.

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

Phase 1: Develop a list of questions and concerns from the Fort McKay Métis community relating to wetland health.

Status: COMPLETED IN September 2018 (Fort McKay Métis Sustainability Centre 2018).

Delivery: Completed in collaboration with the Human Environment Group under the Government of Alberta's Environment Monitoring and Science Division

Phase 2: Complete a pilot community-based wetland monitoring project at two sites in one wetland complex (McClelland Lake Wetland Complex).

Status: COMPLETED IN 2019 and 2020 funded by Environment and Climate Change Canada (Associated Environmental Consultants Inc. & Human Environment Group 2019).

Delivery: Completed by the Fort McKay Métis community in collaboration with Associated Environmental Consultants Inc. and the Human Environment Group under an Environment and Climate Change Canada grant. ALS Environmental laboratory was used for analysis of surface water samples.

Phase 3: Expand the wetland monitoring pilot project to monitor other important wetlands in the Fort McKay Metis harvesting area (add Island Lake wetland as a reference site)

Status: COMPLETED IN 2020 through OSM funding

Delivery: Completed by the Fort McKay Métis community in collaboration with Associated Environmental Consultants Inc. and the Human Environment Group entirely funded by the Oil Sands Monitoring program. Laboratories used include Bureau Veritas, Innotech Vegreville, and Innotech Victoria because they are the labs used by the Wetland TAC and this will ensure our data is comparable in regional datasets.

Phase 4: Continue field data collection at the existing four sites and incorporate two additional sites that were formerly monitored under a pilot project funded by ECCC

Status: STARTED IN 2021, PLANNED TO CONTINUE IN 2024 AND BEYOND USING OSM FUNDING

Delivery: This will be completed by the Fort McKay Métis community in collaboration with Associated Environmental Consultants Inc., the Human Environment Group, and Integral Ecology Group tentatively funded by the OSM program. Laboratories used will align with those used by the Wetland TAC.

*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 2024-25 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.

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:

Apr 1, 2024

13.5 Estimated Data Collection End Date:

Oct 31, 2024

13.6 Estimated Timeline For Upload Start Date:

Dec 1, 2024

13.7 Estimated Timeline For Upload End Date:

Mar 31, 2025

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 add row 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
Vegetation Cover	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location	.xlsx	Open by Default
Groundwater levels	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location	.xlsx	Open by Default
Groundwater quality	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location	.xlsx	Open by Default
Indigenous knowledge - vegetation, wildlife, water levels, water quality, access routes, interactions with industry or non-indigenous land users	Fort McKay Community database	.pdf	Protected by Default
Surface Water Quality	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location		Open by Default
Sediment Quality	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location	.xlsx	Open by Default
Invertebrates	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location	.xlsx	Open by Default
Lichen	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location	.xlsx	Open by Default
Wildlife Camera Data	Fort McKay community database and Wetland TAC data storage location	.xlsx	Open by Default

14.0 2024/25 Deliverables

Add an additional deliverable by clicking on the add row on the bottom right side of table

Type of Deliverable	Delivery Date	Description
Technical Report	Q4	
Stakeholder or Community Presentation	Q4	
Other (Describe in Description Section)	Q4	Presentation to ICBM TAC Members
Other (Describe in Description Section)	Q4	Community Posters

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.

Craig Mahoney - Alberta Environment and Parks

Craig will be the contract manager and the point of contact for establishing the contract between AEP and Fort McKay Métis Nation outlined in this work plan. Invoices related to the activities funded through this contract will be sent to Craig for processing.

Margaret Luker- Fort McKay Métis Nation

Margaret Luker will oversee the project team, track the budget, complete financial reporting, and provide overall project management and coordination between project technical experts and community members. Margaret is an environmental and conservation science specialist with 20 years' experience focusing on environmental, indigenous, and regulatory issues in the Alberta oil sands. She comes with a strong project management, multi-stakeholder, and negotiation/facilitation background. She is currently managing all the agreements for the Fort McKay Metis Nation (FMMN) and served as interim Director for the McKay Metis Sustainability Centre which runs the FMMN community based monitoring program.

Integral Ecology Group

Dr. Thomas Dyck with Integral Ecology Group is an Applied Human Ecologist and Geographer, and has experience working in the field of environmental resource management (cultural impact assessments, traditional land use studies, water vulnerability assessments, and First Nation source water protection planning). Thomas works in partnership with Indigenous communities, governments, and industry: contributing his knowledge of social science theory, methodology, and environmental resource management.

Kristen Andersen - Associated Environmental Consultants Inc.

Kristen will be the technical wetland specialist who helps develop the plan for the community-based wetland monitoring program. She will also deliver training on biological monitoring techniques, wetland mapping and classification and provide support in the field.

Kristen has over 20 years of experience specializing in comprehensive wetlands services including wetland assessment and reclamation as a consultant. Kristen is passionate about education and has been a wetland instructor at the University of Alberta Faculty of Extension for the past 10 years. Her expertise includes vegetation, soils, and hydrology monitoring, functional assessment, remote sensing and wetland restoration. She also runs workshops for the instruction of stream restoration techniques through Associated Environmental. As a volunteer for the Alberta Native Plant Council, she teaches workshops related to plant identification. Kristen was involved in the 2019 and 2020 pilot wetland monitoring project as well as the 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 OSM monitoring project.

No personnel or expertise gaps for successful completion of the project relative to the OSM program mandate have been identified.

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 AEPA 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 AEPA

Add an additional AEPA Staff member by clicking on the add row below the 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

Table 16.1.2 ECCC

Add an additional ECCC Staff member by clicking on the add row below the table. The total FTE (Full Time Equivalent) is Auto Summed (in Table 16.2.2) and converted to a dollar amount.

Name (Last, First)	Role	%Time Allocated to Project

The tables below are the financial tables for Alberta Environment & Protected Areas (AEPA) 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](#). Please note that completion of this Project Finance Breakdown Template is mandatory and must be submitted along with each workplan.

[PROJECT FINANCE BREAKDOWN TEMPLATE](#)

Table 16.2.1 Funding Requested BY ALBERTA ENVIRONMENT & PROTECTED AREAS

Organization - Alberta Environment & Protected Areas ONLY	Total % time allocated to project for AEPA staff	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits (Calculated from Table 16.1.1 above)	0	\$0.00
Operations and Maintenance		
Consumable materials and supplies		
Conferences and meetings travel		
Project-related travel		
Engagement		
Reporting		

Overhead	
Total All Grants (Calculated from Table 16.4 below)	\$150,000.00
Total All Contracts (Calculated from Table 16.5 below)	\$243,600.00
Sub-Total (Calculated)	\$393,600.00
Capital*	
AEPA TOTAL (Calculated)	\$393,600.00

* 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)	0	\$0.00
Operations and Maintenance		
Consumable materials and supplies		
Conferences and meetings travel		
Project-related travel		
Engagement		
Reporting		
Overhead		
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 add table below the table. The total of all Grants is Auto Summed in Table 16.2.1

GRANT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Name	
GRANT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	
Category	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits FTE	\$43,000.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies	\$36,600.00
Conferences and meetings travel	\$4,000.00
Project-related travel	\$16,500.00
Engagement	\$40,400.00
Reporting	\$9,500.00
Overhead	
GRANT TOTAL (Calculated)	\$150,000.00

Table 16.4

Complete ONE table per Contract recipient.

Add a Recipient by clicking on add row below the 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	
CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	
Category	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits	\$85,100.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies	\$300.00
Conferences and meetings travel	
Project-related travel	\$14,400.00
Engagement	
Reporting	\$48,900.00
Overhead	
CONTRACT TOTAL (Calculated)	\$148,700.00
CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Name	
CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	
Category	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits	
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies	
Conferences and meetings travel	
Project-related travel	\$5,900.00
Engagement	\$26,600.00
Reporting	\$30,400.00
Overhead	
CONTRACT TOTAL (Calculated)	\$62,900.00
CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Name	

CONTRACT RECIPIENT - ONLY: Organization	
Category	Total Funding Requested from OSM
Salaries and Benefits	\$21,600.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies	
Conferences and meetings travel	
Project-related travel	\$4,400.00
Engagement	
Reporting	\$6,000.00
Overhead	
CONTRACT TOTAL (Calculated)	\$32,000.00

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 AEPA and ECCC ONLY	\$0.00
Operations and Maintenance	
Consumable materials and supplies Sums totals for AEPA and ECCC ONLY	\$0.00
Conferences and meetings travel Sums totals for AEPA and ECCC ONLY	\$0.00
Project-related travel Sums totals for AEPA and ECCC ONLY	\$0.00
Engagement Sums totals for AEPA and ECCC ONLY	\$0.00
Reporting Sums totals for AEPA and ECCC ONLY	\$0.00
Overhead Sums totals for AEPA and ECCC ONLY	\$0.00
Total All Grants (from table 16.2.1 above) Sums totals for AEPA Tables ONLY	\$150,000.00
Total All Contracts (from table 16.2.1 above) Sums totals for AEPA Tables ONLY	\$243,600.00
SUB-TOTAL (Calculated)	\$393,600.00
Capital* Sums total for AEPA	
GRAND PROJECT TOTAL	\$393,600.00

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.

The budget will be held by Fort McKay Métis and managed using a detailed budget spreadsheet. Any cost overruns will be assessed to see if there is a realistic reason for the additional cost or if there is a solution where the additional cost can be avoided. Unavoidable additional costs will be recorded and the budget will be rearranged where possible to balance it. Budget which has not been spent will be used to create educational materials relating to the wetland monitoring program, or to present the results at a conference.

This project is a continuing project and the budget was underspent in 2020 due to funds being released later than expected leading to a reduced scope. The 2021 scope was completed within the allotted budget, and the 2022 scope was completed within budget. Ongoing management of budgets will be conducted by staff experienced in project management who have been involved in the monitoring program since 2019 providing the benefits of project-specific experience and knowledge.

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 add row on the bottom right side of table.

Description	Source	Equivalent Amount (\$CAD)
	TOTAL	\$0.00

19.0 Consent & Declaration of Completion

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.

Lead Applicant Name

Margaret Luker

Title/Organization

Agreement Relations Manager, Fort McKay Métis Nation

Signature

Margaret Luker  Digitally signed by Margaret Luker
Date: 2023.11.03 15:12:00 -06'00'

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

Wetland Scientist, Alberta Environment and Parks

Title/Organization

Craig Mahoney

Signature

Please save your form and refer to the instructions page for submission link.

Governance Review & Decision Process

this phase follows submission and triggers the Governance Review

TAC Review (Date):

ICBMAC Review (Date):

SIKIC Review (Date):

OC Review (Date):

Final Recommendations:

Decision Pool:

Notes:

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):

SIKIC Review (Date):

OC Review (Date):

Comments:

Decision Pool:

Notes & Additional Actions for Successful Work Plan Implementation:

Signature