



Webequie Supply Road Project  
Impact Assessment Agency of Canada  
600-55 York Street  
Toronto, Ontario M5J 1R7  
[webequie@iaac-aeic.gc.ca](mailto:webequie@iaac-aeic.gc.ca)

February 26, 2026

**RE: FRIENDS OF THE ATTAWAPISKAT RIVER**  
**Comments on the Final Impact Statement of the Webequie Supply Road Project (IAAC**  
**Reference No. 80183)**

---

This comment is submitted by the Friends of the Attawapiskat River (the “**Friends**”) in response to the call for feedback by the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada’s (“**Agency**”) on Webequie First Nation’s Organization’s (“**WFN**”) Impact Statement (“**IS**”) for the Webequie Supply Road Project (“**WSR**”).<sup>1</sup>

In providing these comments, we remind the Agency that we are the ancestral people of the lands where the Ring of Fire is proposed. We, the Oji-cree, Ojibway, and Omushkegowuk people, have lived in harmony with these lands given to us by the Creator since time immemorial. We are the Water People. The water gives us life, and we take care of the water in return. This is our duty to the Creator.

We are the ancestors of the Headmen who signed Treaty 9 with the Crown to peacefully share the lands. Our Natural Laws teach us to respect the land and to maintain our relationship with the Creator. Our traditional ways do not involve greed or violence to these lands, but love, harmony and an ongoing commitment to each other.

As we detail in our comments below, which draw on our past recommendations and reflect on whether our efforts and voice have been heard, we call on the Agency to uphold Treaty promises to our people. Our communities rely on openness to thrive, and all community members must be involved in any process on our lands.

To date, our communities are in the dark and are facing ongoing health and water crises, a testament to the government’s failure to respect our rights, including our rights to free, prior and informed consent. This is our legal right pursuant to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and required under Canadian law.

---

<sup>1</sup> Webequie First Nation, [Impact Statement](#): Webequie Supply Road Project (February 2026) [IS]; per an email received from the IAAC dated Feb 6, 2026 “Comments submitted by February 26, 2026, will be considered to inform IAAC’s decision of whether the proponent’s Impact Statement has all the necessary information to conduct the impact assessment and IAAC’s draft Impact Assessment report, as applicable. Comments submitted thereafter will be considered for the remaining steps of the impact assessment process.”

After this short 20 day comment period, we will still be here. We will continue to live on our lands peacefully and uphold our Treaty promises. We call on the Agency to do the same and properly consult with all community members prior to making any decision for this impact assessment.

## **I. BACKGROUND**

### **a. The Friends of the Attawapiskat River**

The Friends of the Attawapiskat River (the Friends') is an Indigenous, grassroots advocacy group. We are community members from Attawapiskat, Peawanuck, Kashechewan, Fort Albany, Neskantaga and Moose Factory in Treaty 9 territory. We share concerns about the waters, lands, and wildlife. Each of us and our families not only live near the Attawapiskat River, but have personally experienced the impact of unsafe water on our health, the environment and our traditional lands.

We work to bring awareness to the people, who still travel and live on our waterways, about the proposed 'Ring of Fire' mining development that would forever contaminate our lands and destroy the muskeg (peatlands) – one of the last remaining intact peatlands in the world.<sup>2</sup> We also seek to advance knowledge of the proposed Ring of Fire within the Attawapiskat watershed and to enable community participation in decision-making processes that impact the health of the Attawapiskat River.

The Attawapiskat River is central to the exercise of Indigenous rights and to the well-being of communities that depend on it. The river supports harvesting practices, provides materials for shelter, and supports the wildlife that travel along its waters. The river is not isolated; rather, it forms part of an interconnected watershed system in which water flows across muskeg and peatlands of the Hudson Bay – James Bay Lowlands before discharging into the Arctic Ocean. The interconnected nature of this ecosystem means that disturbances in one location will carry downstream, with significant consequences to ecosystems, food systems, and communities far beyond a project's immediate footprint. Once this water is disturbed, we have no means of reversing the harm to its present state– the way it was before any resource development. If developed, the proposed Ring of Fire will have significant negative impacts on our way of life, existence, and livelihoods.

As Treaty 9 people, we, as the Friends, have a shared responsibility to protect Treaty lands from exploitation and degradation. This means safeguarding the integrity of the boreal and muskeg of the Hudson Bay-James Bay lowlands, its significant contribution to mitigating climate change, and the health of their grandchildren and future generations. It is in this context that the WSR must be assessed.

In making these comments to the Agency, the Friends note they are not speaking on behalf of the First Nation leadership where its members are based (including Attawapiskat, Neskantaga, Peawanuck, Kashechewan and Fort Albany First Nations), but rather providing these comments as Treaty 9 rights

---

<sup>2</sup> Friends of the Attawapiskat River, online: <[friendsoftheattawapiskatriver.ca/](http://friendsoftheattawapiskatriver.ca/)>.

holders and community members. Furthermore, these comments do not constitute consultation nor discharge the Crown's obligations per section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

## **b. The Proposed Webequie Supply Road**

The proposed WSR involves the construction and operation of a permanent, all-season road connecting Webequie First Nation and the proposed Ring of Fire region to Ontario's broader transportation network.

As described in the IS:

"The proposed WSR will be a new 35-metre-wide right-of-way to accommodate a two-lane all-season road that is approximately 107 kilometres long, connecting Webequie and its airport to existing mineral exploration and proposed future mining development near McFaulds Lake, within an area referred to as the Ring of Fire."<sup>3</sup>

The IS identifies that the proposed WSR will facilitate access to existing mineral exploration and proposed future mining development in the proposed "Ring of Fire."<sup>4</sup>

The region referred to as the "Ring of Fire" is an area located on the ancestral lands of Indigenous peoples, including the Ojibway, Oji-Cree, and Omushkegowuk who have inhabited these lands since time immemorial and whom pursuant to Treaty 9, continue to exercise treaty rights affirmed by the spirit and intent of treaties and protected by section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. While the IS adopts the term "Ring of Fire," it is important to acknowledge that this terminology originates from industry and is not reflective of the significance or origin of the land.

## **c. Our Direct Interest and History of Engagement**

As caretakers of the land and an Indigenous grassroots group, our views and concerns are directly relevant to the Agency, which, as the Crown, has a duty to respect Indigenous rights, which necessarily includes protection for the Attawapiskat River, which has been our provider since time immemorial.

We have spent years leading community workshops, regional gatherings and public presentations, and have provided extensive written and oral contributions to provincial, federal, and international bodies on topics spanning Indigenous Natural law and Cree cultural perspectives. These efforts come in response to government and industry actions that threaten our rights, those of our community and the accompanying health of the Hudson–James Bay Lowlands.

---

<sup>3</sup> Webequie First Nation, [Summary of the Impact Statement](#): Webequie Supply Road Project (February 2026) at 9 [Executive Summary].

<sup>4</sup> Executive Summary at 9.

The Friends have been very active in raising concerns about the exclusion of the grassroots from decision-making regarding the proposed Ring of Fire and related infrastructure, including the WSR. For instance, in January 2020, in response to the Agency's Draft Tailored IS Guidelines and Indigenous Engagement Plan, the Friends visited the communities of Timmins, Fort Albany, Kashechewan and Attawapiskat, travelling over 600 km from Timmins to Attawapiskat by seasonal winter and ice roads, to gather input directly from affected communities.

During our week-long travels, the Friends heard directly and collected feedback from leadership, elders, youth, and community members in community centres, meeting rooms, and classrooms. Engagement occurred at various times of day, including evenings and weekends, to maximize accessibility. While recognizing the limitations of the 40-day comment period and constraints of winter travel, best efforts were made to ensure those interested in learning more and wishing to share their input with the Agency had an opportunity to do so. In all, we met with over 100 individuals and reached out to the media so that the public, more generally, was also aware of this opportunity to comment.<sup>5</sup> During these sessions, a high level of interest was expressed by the community regarding proposed development in the Ring of Fire region and the associated infrastructure. However, many community members demonstrated limited awareness of the federal impact assessment process and its commencement in relation to the Webequi Supply Road Project.

Before the 2020 comment period, the Friends invited the Agency to participate in in-community engagement sessions to facilitate direct dialogue and improve access to information. Although the Agency indicated that visits would occur, in-community sessions did not proceed, and subsequent invitations during the public comment period were also declined. Engagement opportunities with the Agency were instead confined to Webex platforms or off-reserve locations. For fly-in communities, reliable internet access is limited and travel to off-reserve locations is cost-prohibitive. In these circumstances, centralized or online formats present practical barriers to meaningful participation.

The concerns articulated in this submission are not new. They reflect views expressed by community members over several years of engagement concerning the proposed development in the proposed Ring of Fire region and related infrastructure, such as the WSR. We request that all of our prior comments and correspondence be drawn on, as the Agency now reviews the completeness of the IS.

## **II. GAPS IN THE IMPACT STATEMENT**

### **a. Public Engagement and Information Sharing**

---

<sup>5</sup> CBC News "Ring of Fire communities get chance to share concerns with federal government" (16 Jan 2020), online: <[cbc.ca/news/canada/sudbury/communities-ring-fire-1.5429812](http://cbc.ca/news/canada/sudbury/communities-ring-fire-1.5429812)>.

The Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines (“**Guidelines**”)<sup>6</sup> require that the proponent demonstrate that they meaningfully engaged with local communities, technical experts, the public, associations and stakeholders, while “prioritiz[ing] the participation of those who are most affected by the proposed project, while also ensuring that interested members of the public have an opportunity to share their views.”<sup>7</sup> Meaningful public participation is also a core purpose of the *Impact Assessment Act* (“**IAA**”),<sup>8</sup> which seeks to ensure that Indigenous peoples whose rights may be affected are provided appropriate opportunities to participate in the process. Despite these safeguards, we are not confident that the participation opportunities provided thus far have been capable of creating a space for Indigenous legal traditions, worldviews, and natural laws to inform the assessment of a project’s impacts.

The IS outlines a range of engagement initiatives undertaken by the Proponent during the impact assessment process, including monthly newsletters, social media and radio advertisements, as well as livestream sessions and radio call-in shows.<sup>9</sup> While these efforts are acknowledged, the Friends submit that the IS documents merely describe engagement activities without demonstrating how these activities enabled meaningful participation or informed consideration of community concerns.

Moreover, the structure and accessibility of the IS itself present significant barriers to participation. The IS consists of extensive and highly technical materials organized into individual PDF chapters, making it very difficult to find, trace, and understand the information. This fragmented nature, coupled with the short 30-day public comment period, substantially limits the practical ability of participants to conduct an informed and thorough review of these materials. For instance, the table of contents alone extends to approximately 92 pages, raising serious concerns regarding whether participants could reasonably engage with the substance of the remaining documentation within the allotted timeframe. In these circumstances, no “mutual understanding”<sup>10</sup> could possibly emerge from such a document, especially not within 30 days.

Recognizing these accessibility and time constraints, the Friends wrote a letter to the Chief of Webequie First Nation - respecting their role as the proponent - to request an extension of the public comment period in order to facilitate informed participation. While our request remains outstanding, we remind the Agency that the consultation requires, at a minimum, “sufficient time to participate in consultation, including the review of technical information.”<sup>11</sup> In *Tsleil-Waututh Nation v. Canada*<sup>12</sup>, the Federal Court of Appeal confirmed that “meaningful dialogue” requires more than simply receiving and understanding the concerns of affected Indigenous applicants, but rather “a considered, meaningful two-way

---

<sup>6</sup> Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, “[Tailored Impact Statement Guidelines: Webequie Supply Road Project](#)” (24 February 2020) [**Guidelines**].

<sup>7</sup> Guidelines at 21.

<sup>8</sup> *IAA*, s 6(2) and 11.

<sup>9</sup> IS at 2-95.

<sup>10</sup> *Clyde River (Hamlet) v. Petroleum Geo-Services Inc.*, 2017 SCC 40, [2017] 1 S.C.R. 1069 at para 49.

<sup>11</sup> Government of Canada, “[Policy Context: Indigenous Participation in Impact Assessment](#)” (7 August 2025).

<sup>12</sup> *Tsleil-Waututh Nation v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2018 CA 153 (CanLII), [2019] 2 FCR 3 [*Tsleil-Waututh Nation*].

dialogue”<sup>13</sup> that grapples with the real concerns of the Indigenous applicants so as to explore possible accommodation of those concerns.<sup>14</sup>

While the duty to consult rests with the Crown, the impact assessment process must nevertheless be structured in a manner capable of supporting informed engagement. In these circumstances and as directly impacted rightsholders, limiting the time available to review extensive and highly technical materials constrains our ability to adequately understand and respond to the IS, thereby limiting the capacity of the assessment process to support meaningful dialogue and “mutual understanding”<sup>15</sup> of the project impacts. Despite the imposed timelines, the Friends retain the right to provide supplemental materials and comments.

**Recommendation No. 1: The Agency should ensure proponents understand that they can extend timelines within the IA process, recognizing that comment periods must provide impacted rightsholders with accessible and consolidated project materials to ensure a meaningful opportunity to review and respond to the technical information contained in the Impact Statement.**

**Recommendation No. 2: All engagement processes must enable the full and fair participation of Indigenous community members, including women, elders, and youth, and any decision-making must be undertaken with their consent, in keeping with their customs, worldviews and inherent laws.**

**Recommendation No. 3: All engagement activities must be conducted in both English and Cree, and in the community chosen by the Indigenous organization or nation. For instance, recognizing that many community members live off-reserve, efforts must be made to ensure that all community members have an opportunity to be informed and aware, to participate, and to influence Impact Assessment outcomes.**

**Recommendation No. 4: Information sharing must reach beyond leadership to community members and the public. This is critical to build public trust in the Agency, Canada, and the proponent’s intended developments.**

**Recommendation No. 5: The impact assessment process must demonstrate how the comments received for this project have informed assessment findings and decision-making, in order to ensure transparency and maintain public confidence in the process.**

## **b. Purpose and Scope of Project**

The Guidelines require that the IS describe “the underlying opportunity or issue that the Project intends to seize or solve and should be described from the perspective of the proponent.”<sup>16</sup> Importantly, where a

---

<sup>13</sup> *Tsleil-Waututh Nation* at para 558.

<sup>14</sup> *Tsleil-Waututh Nation* at para 6.

<sup>15</sup> *Tsleil-Waututh Nation* at para 500.

<sup>16</sup> IS at 6.

project forms part of a larger sequence of projects, the IS must “outline the larger context, including likely future developments by other proponents that may use project infrastructure, and activities that may be enabled by the current Project.”<sup>17</sup> This requirement aligns with section 22(1)(e) of the *IAA*, which mandates that an impact assessment take into account the purpose and need for the designated project.

The IS frames the purpose of the WSR in terms of the economic significance of Ontario’s mining sector and the mineral potential within the proposed Ring of Fire region.<sup>18</sup> The WSR is therefore advanced as enabling infrastructure for future mining development.

Where a project forms part of a broader sequence of developments or is intended to enable future developments, the scope of the assessment must reflect the broader enabling function. In such circumstances, the IS must evaluate the reasonably foreseeable regional effects arising from the construction and operation of a project of this nature.

In response to the Guidelines, the Friends recommended that the scope of the assessment apply to all reasonably foreseeable projects that may result from or rely on the construction of the WSR. The Friends noted that, as drafted, these developments were referenced in the context of a potential cumulative effects assessment, rather than integrated across the full scope of the Guidelines considerations and requirements. The Friends specifically identified the following reasonably foreseeable developments:

- Construction of upgrades to the Anaconda/Painter Lake Forestry Road;
- The construction and operation of the Northern Road Link (proposed road linking the northern portion of the Marten Falls Community Access Road to the Ring of Fire area);
- A potential East-West Road;
- The Eagle’s Nest Mine;
- Mining activities associated with the following deposits: Black Thor, BlackBird, Big Daddy, Black Label;
- Increased winter road traffic during Operations and Maintenance by future mining proponents; and
- Advanced mineral exploration activities in the Ring of Fire area.

Despite this recommendation to the Agency, the IS does not substantively integrate these foreseeable developments into the assessment of the project. Instead, the analysis largely focuses on the construction and operational effects of the road corridor, with limited integration of the broader regional transformation that the infrastructure is intended to facilitate.

**Recommendation No. 6: The Impact Statement must expand the scope of the assessment to meaningfully evaluate reasonably foreseeable projects and activities enabled by the WSR, including mining activities associated with the Black Thor, BlackBird, Big Daddy, and Black Label deposits,**

---

<sup>17</sup> Guidelines at 6.

<sup>18</sup> IS at 1-14.

increased winter road traffic during operations by future mining proponents, and advanced mineral exploration.

**c. Regional Assessment and Project Scoping**

The Guidelines provide that where an ongoing or completed regional assessment exists in the proposed project area, proponents are expected to use information generated through that process to inform the cumulative effects assessment,<sup>19</sup> consistent with section 22(1)(q) of the *IAA*.

The Friends submit that the IS does not meaningfully demonstrate how the federal regional assessment for the Ring of Fire region has informed the scoping or evaluation of the project's effects, despite the WSR's integral connection to broader mineral development anticipated within the region.

**Recommendation No. 7: The Impact Statement should be aligned with and informed by the federal Regional Assessment for the Ring of Fire region to ensure that cumulative and regional effects are properly understood and considered before decision-making.**

**d. Characterization of Wetlands & Inclusion of Mushkeg**

The Guidelines required that the IS describe the "environmental significance and value of the geographical setting in which the Project will take place and the study areas,"<sup>20</sup> and "environmentally sensitive areas, such as [...] ecological reserves, ecologically and biologically sensitive areas, wetlands, and habitats of federally or provincially listed species at risk and other sensitive areas."<sup>21</sup> The Guidelines further required the proponent to "quantify, delineate and describe wetlands (fens, marshes, peat lands, bogs, etc.) within the local study area potentially directly, indirectly and/or cumulatively effected by the Project."<sup>22</sup>

In the Friends' previous submission, this concern was raised directly, highlighting the significance of the mushkeg in this region, and how the project needs to be framed in terms of water flow, connectivity, and to reflect the unique cultural, ecological, and hydrological cycles of this region.

While the IS acknowledges that the proposed WSR will cross the Hudson Bay Lowlands and identifies these areas as "sensitive and unique,"<sup>23</sup> the assessment of mushkeg is largely confined to road design considerations and construction-phase mitigation measures, thus substantively failing to evaluate the ecological, hydrological and culturally significant impacts of the project to the mushkeg in this region.

---

<sup>19</sup> Guidelines at 131.

<sup>20</sup> Guidelines at 7.

<sup>21</sup> Guidelines at 7.

<sup>22</sup> Guidelines at 42.

<sup>23</sup> IS at 4-45 and 46.

As we know in mushkeg, water flows under the land. Fish also travel ‘under the land’ by making use of tunnels carved within the mushkeg. As one Elder within the Friends has described, ‘we are the water people. The swamps and lakes create mushkeg – it’s a being.’ As another community member within the Friends remarked, ‘the mushkeg is living and breathing. For us, it is our Amazon. It cleans the air, the water – it’s a big lung and filter for everything.’

Mushkeg does not function as a linear corridor. Instead, it acts like a sponge in which water courses, water crossings, and delineations between water bodies do not neatly form. These characteristics and the uniqueness of the mushkeg must be reflected throughout this impact assessment process.

**Recommendation No. 8: The WSR is located in globally significant peatlands (ie, mushkeg). The Impact Statement should explicitly recognize mushkeg as a distinct ecological, hydrological, and culturally significant system and assess projects' effects on valued components accordingly.**

**e. Water Level Changes and Current Stressors**

The Guidelines require that the IS “provide the timing of freeze/thaw cycles, ice cover, and ice conditions for surface water bodies in the Project area,”<sup>24</sup> and consider water level changes, seasonal variation, and associated spatial and temporal effects to groundwater.<sup>25</sup> The Guidelines further require that the IS describe “existing environmental, health, social and economic components, interrelations and interactions as well as the variability in these components, processes and interactions over time scales and geographic boundaries appropriate to the Project, including consideration of variability due to potential future climate change” (emphasis added).<sup>26</sup>

In the Friends’ previous submission on the Guidelines, concerns were raised that there was no meaningful consideration of how seasonable freeze/thaw cycles and breakup in the spring affect mushkeg water levels. In addition, the effect of seasonal variations and breakup in light of climate change was also not addressed. Participants from communities within the Attawapiskat watershed have already observed changes in water conditions and declining levels of inland lakes. Thus, a review of water levels in light of climate change and the Ring of Fire’s footprint is critical.

Moreover, while climate change is repeatedly mentioned throughout the proponents' Impact Assessment materials, it is primarily in the context of the proposed project’s contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and Canada’s climate commitments. The intersection of climate change with valued components such as changes to the physical environment, the environment, and human health is a critical deficiency that should be remedied.

---

<sup>24</sup> Guidelines at 45.

<sup>25</sup> Guidelines at 38, 44 and 49. on on

<sup>26</sup> Guidelines at 29.

The IS, including Appendix I Climate Change Resilience Review Report, considers freeze/thaw cycles in the context of project design and construction,<sup>27</sup> and how the freeze/thaw patterns affect project components or present delays to the project schedule.<sup>28</sup> Climate change or “climate hazards” are similarly addressed in terms of damage to the project components and road integrity.<sup>29</sup>

Notably, the IS does not consider freeze/thaw variability and seasonal breakup and their effects on water levels, the mushkeg, or broader watershed dynamics. The failure to meaningfully assess how these cycles, in combination with climate change, may interact with project activities limits consideration of the potential effects on mushkeg and downstream environments. The Friends submit that particular consideration of these impacts is necessary so that the ecological and hydrological functioning of mushkeg ecosystems is adequately characterized and reflected within the impact assessment process.

**Recommendation No. 9: The Impact Statement must give detailed consideration to seasonal freeze/thaw patterns and breakup processes in the context of climate change. The assessment should evaluate how climate-related changes may interact with valued components, including the physical environment, hydrological systems, and human health.**

#### **f. Legislative and Regulatory Framework**

The Guidelines require that the IS identify all “legislation and other regulatory approvals that are applicable to the Project at the federal, provincial, regional and municipal levels.”<sup>30</sup>

Section 1.4 of the IS lists applicable federal and provincial statutes and permits, including the *Environmental Assessment Act*, the *IAA*, and other relevant permits and approvals at the provincial and federal levels. Notably, the IS fails to mention the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (“**UNDRIP**”) and the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act (“UN Declaration Act”)*, thereby undermining the integrity of the Impact Assessment process.

The *IAA* was written with UNDRIP in mind, as evidenced by the preamble, which states how the “Government of Canada is committed to implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,”<sup>31</sup> including through impact assessment processes. UNDRIP affirms minimum international standards for the survival, dignity, and well-being of Indigenous peoples and directly informs the interpretation and application of the *IAA*, as evidenced by the *IAA* preamble. Among other things, UNDRIP provides:

#### **Article 26**

[...]

---

<sup>27</sup> IS at 24-13.

<sup>28</sup> IS at 24-28.

<sup>29</sup> IS at 24-6.

<sup>30</sup> Guidelines at 8.

<sup>31</sup> [IAA](#), preamble.

2. Indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired.

**Article 32**

[...]

2. States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources.

**Article 37**

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the recognition, observance and enforcement of treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements concluded with States or their successors and to have States honour and respect such treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements.

2. Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as diminishing or eliminating the rights of indigenous peoples contained in treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements.

By virtue of the *UN Declaration Act*, UNDRIP has been enshrined into Canada's positive law<sup>32</sup> and the federal government is required to act in a manner consistent with UNDRIP, recognizing that Indigenous peoples have suffered historic injustices as a result of colonization and dispossession of their lands, territories and resources, and that all relations with Indigenous peoples must be based on the recognition and implementation of the inherent right to self-determination.<sup>33</sup>

This commitment to reconciliation is reinforced by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada's Calls to Action, which affirm UNDRIP as the foundational framework for reconciliation in Canada:

***Call to Action 43***

*We call upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to fully adopt and implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the framework for reconciliation.*

***Call to Action 44***

*We call upon the Government of Canada to develop a national action plan, strategies, and other concrete measures to achieve the goals of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.*

---

<sup>32</sup> *Kebaowek First Nation v Canadian Nuclear Laboratories*, [2025 FC 319](#) at para 78 [*Kebaowek*].

<sup>33</sup> [United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act](#), S.C. 2021, c. 14, preamble.

UNDRIP provides the foundational framework for reconciliation. Since it now forms part of domestic law, UNDRIP must be used to interpret Canadian law and legal obligations,<sup>34</sup> including the *IAA* and the Agency's responsibility to uphold Indigenous rights. These rights are protected by section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. They "are not frozen and are capable of evolution and growth," and that there is "an urgent need to respect and promote the rights of Indigenous peoples affirmed in treaties, agreements, and other constructive arrangements".<sup>35</sup> This demonstrates that Indigenous rights under UNDRIP are protected by section 35 and creates a corresponding duty to respect these rights.

**Recommendation No. 10: The Impact Statement must identify and incorporate Canada's international and domestic obligations under UNDRIP and the *UN Declaration Act*, as well as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action, and explain how the project will be developed in a manner consistent with those obligations, including obtaining free, prior, and informed consent of all potentially affected Indigenous peoples.**

**g. Commitments to Protect Climate and Safeguard Biodiversity**

The Guidelines highlight how "the Government of Canada, through *IAA*, recognizes that the impact assessment contributes to Canada's understanding and ability to meet, first, its environmental obligations, and second, its commitments in respect of climate change."<sup>36</sup> The Guidelines further require that the IS "provide an assessment of the Project's emissions potentially contributing or adding to existing ground ozone levels,"<sup>37</sup> consistent with section 22(1)(j) of the *IAA*, which requires consideration of the extent to which a designated project may hinder or contribute to the Government of Canada's ability to meet its environmental obligations and its commitments in respect of climate change.

However, among the environmental obligations and commitments the IS does not acknowledge or engage with is Canada's commitments under the *Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework* (the "**Global Biodiversity Framework**").<sup>38</sup> In December 2022, Canada, along with 195 nations, adopted the Global Biodiversity Framework. The preamble to the Framework notes that the parties are "[a]larmed by the continued loss of biodiversity and the threat that this poses to nature and human well-being;" and "[r]eaffirms its expectation that Parties and other Governments will ensure that the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities are respected and given effect to in the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal global biodiversity framework."<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> *Kebaowek*, at para 76-77, 80.

<sup>35</sup> United Nations (General Assembly), [United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#) (2007), preamble.

<sup>36</sup> Guidelines at 137.

<sup>37</sup> Guidelines at 84.

<sup>38</sup> Convention on Biological Diversity. *Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework* — [Target 22: Ensure Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice and Information Related to Biodiversity for All](#) [**Global Biodiversity Framework**].

<sup>39</sup> Global Biodiversity Framework, preamble.

Target 22 is of primary significance as it ensures Indigenous Peoples' participation in decision-making. More specifically, it is designed to:

Ensure the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation in decision-making, and access to justice and information related to biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities, respecting their cultures and their rights over lands, territories, resources, and traditional knowledge, as well as by women and girls, children and youth, and persons with disabilities and ensure the full protection of environmental human rights defenders.

The Friends submit that the Global Biodiversity Framework is directly relevant to the assessment of the project, particularly given the interconnected nature of the mushkeg, wetlands, and watersheds that will be impacted by the Project and its enabling function. This framework emphasizes the urgent need to halt and reverse biodiversity loss and requires equitable decision-making that respects Indigenous peoples' rights, cultures, and traditional knowledge. Consideration of these commitments is therefore necessary to ensure that potential effects are adequately assessed within the impact assessment process.

**Recommendation No. 11: The Impact Statement must identify and incorporate Canada's commitments under the *Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*, and explain how the commitments under the framework will inform the scope, conduct, and decision-making of an impact assessment, particularly in light of the sensitive and interconnected ecosystems potentially affected by the project.**

#### **h. Intergenerational Effects & Characterizing the Severity of Impacts**

The Guidelines state that, "in order to assess a project's contribution to sustainability, consideration should be given to the long-term effects on the well-being of present and future generations."<sup>40</sup> The Guidelines further prove that the proponents are "encouraged" to include a description of the intergenerational impacts of the project on community members.<sup>41</sup>

In the Friends' previous submission on the Guidelines, concerns were raised regarding the limited treatment of intergenerational effects within the assessment framework. The Friends submit that consideration of intergenerational impacts within the IS remains deficient. Principles of intergenerational and intragenerational equity are key sustainability principles and squarely within the purposes of the *IAA*, including the requirement under section 22(1)(i) to assess the extent to which a designated project contributes to sustainability. The act defines sustainability as "the ability to protect the environment, contribute to the social and economic well-being of the people of Canada and preserve their health in a manner that benefits present and future generations".<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Guidelines at 37.

<sup>41</sup> Guidelines at 117.

<sup>42</sup> Guidelines at 139.

Given the permanence of the project and the anticipated operating lifespan of the proposed Ring of Fire, potential effects must be considered over extended temporal scales, including impacts that may persist for at least 100 years into the future.

The IS summarizes the effects assessment across a broad range of “valued components,” including geology, terrain and soils, surface and groundwater resources, vegetation and wetlands, atmospheric environment, fish and wildlife habitat, species at risk, human health, Indigenous rights, and cultural heritage resources, among others.<sup>43</sup> However, intergenerational effects are not identified or assessed as a distinct valued component within the assessment framework.

While the IS acknowledges that certain valued components may “experience long-term effects, including how those effects could change over time, and how they could affect future generations,”<sup>44</sup> consideration of intergenerational sustainability remains limited.

**Recommendation No. 12: Each valued component assessed in the Impact Statement should explicitly require consideration of intergenerational effects and accompanying risks imposed on future generations, including those arising from the WSR’s enabling function and the reasonably foreseeable mining exploration and development occurring in the Ring of Fire.**

#### **i. Boreal Caribou as a Valued Component**

The Guidelines require that boreal caribou, a listed species at risk,<sup>45</sup> be assessed as a valued component, which includes monitoring effects on caribou and their habitat to verify impact assessment predictions, evaluate mitigation measures, and identify any unanticipated effects requiring adaptive management.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, in describing effects on caribou, the Guidelines require the IS to “provide an assessment of the potential adverse effects on boreal caribou habitat (e.g., at the range and sub-range scales) considering the direction provided in the [Range Management Plans] and [General Habitat Description].”<sup>47</sup>

In their previous submission on the Guidelines, the Friends supported the identification of boreal caribou as an individual valued component and emphasized the importance of assessing cumulative effects across Far North caribou ranges, given their migration into regions that will be impacted by the roads and mining exploration facilitated by the project.

During our engagement sessions, community members expressed a high degree of concern about woodland caribou, noting that the exploration activities and accompanying activities, such as draining of mushkeg and water taking, will impact the land and their habitat. Concerns were also raised regarding

---

<sup>43</sup> Executive Summary at 8-54.

<sup>44</sup> Executive Summary at 8-54.

<sup>45</sup> Guidelines at 60.

<sup>46</sup> Guidelines at 124.

<sup>47</sup> Guidelines at 95.

disease incidence and the potential for project-related disturbances to increase existing pressures on already stressed caribou ranges.

The Impact Statement defines the Regional Study Area for caribou as the “Missisa and Ozhiski Caribou Ranges.”<sup>48</sup> While this reflects range boundaries, the Friends remain concerned that the assessment will not adequately consider cumulative and regional effects associated with the mining development facilitated by the Project, particularly in light of the migratory nature of boreal caribou.

**Recommendation No. 13: The Far North caribou range should be included within the Impact Statement’s mapping of baseline conditions and assessment of cumulative effects. As migratory animals, they will be impacted by the roads and the accompanying mining exploration triggered by the development.**

#### **j. Cumulative Effects and Pre-Existing Human and Environmental Health Conditions**

The Guidelines require that the IS identify and assess the Project’s cumulative effects, including cumulative environmental, health, social and economic effects. The Guidelines further provide that the cumulative assessment consider “cumulative effects to rights of Indigenous peoples and cultures, for all potentially impacted groups, including those located in the areas which will be impacted by increased access to the region by exploration and mineral development projects.”<sup>49</sup> This requirement reflects the broader obligations under section 22(1) of the IAA.

In their previous submission on the Guidelines, the Friends recommended that the projects’ assessment of cumulative effects account for historical changes within the watershed that have been caused by prior human activity and industrial developments, highlighting that present-day ecological conditions should not be a marker for which impacts are measured.

The Impact Statement does not meaningfully consider prior human activity or industrial development within the watershed as part of its cumulative effects assessment. The Friends remain concerned that assessing project effects against present-day conditions risks understanding cumulative impacts already experienced within the region.

**Recommendation No. 14: The Impact Statement should not rely only on present-day ecological and watershed health conditions, but ensure the projects’ cumulative effects assessment takes into account historical changes within the watershed that have been caused by prior human activity and industrial developments.**

#### **k. Community Health and Risk Assessment**

---

<sup>48</sup> IS at 49.

<sup>49</sup> Guidelines at 131.

The Guidelines provide that the proponent must conduct a preliminary model to determine whether a Human Health Risk Assessment is required.<sup>50</sup> The Guidelines further require the IS to assess and quantify health risks from contaminants of potential concern, including mercury, through pathways such as the “consumption of country foods and differential risk for vulnerable subgroups.”<sup>51</sup>

Among the most repeated concerns we hear about from our membership and during community gatherings is the need to study cumulative effects on human health, which include both existing contaminated sites and future health impacts or exposures. We know that harm to the land is harm to health and well-being, and already, we live with a high incidence of cancers and skin conditions in the communities. Ensuring the project is measured in light of its impacts on community health is vital to building trust and ensuring an open, transparent decision-making process.

As we stated and shared with the Agency as part of our Declaration of Protection for our Lands and Waters:

The health of these lands and waters are vital to maintaining our connection to our ancestors and to the land, water and wildlife;  
Crown interest and short-term business interests cannot continue to be prioritized over the health, lands, and Natural Laws of Indigenous communities.<sup>52</sup>

In our previous submission on the Guidelines, the Friends requested a study of mercury on human health and the environment that considers the full lifecycle of the project, including legacy contamination. This assessment aligns with Canada's commitments under the Minamata Convention to protect human health and the environment from anthropogenic emissions of mercury and its compounds.

The Impact Statement includes a Human Health Risk Assessment (Appendix P), in which human health is identified as a valued component of the assessment. This assessment evaluates potential human exposure to contaminants (including mercury) across environmental media, including water, soil, sediment, or air. Based on the proponent’s assessment of the valued components – including air quality, geology, terrain and soils, surface water resources, groundwater resources, and vegetation, fish and wildlife – no significant project-related increases in contaminant concentrations were predicted across these media, except in relation to air quality.<sup>53</sup> Accordingly, air quality is the primary pathway through which potential mercury-related human health risks are assessed in detail.

The Friends submit that this approach does not sufficiently consider cumulative or long-term contamination pathways, including mercury movement within wetlands and interconnected hydrological

---

<sup>50</sup> Guidelines at 103.

<sup>51</sup> Guidelines at 103.

<sup>52</sup> Friends of the Attawapiskat River, Declaration of Protection for Our Lands & Waters, online <<https://friendsoftheattawapiskatriver.ca/support-our-protection-declaration/>>

<sup>53</sup> Executive Summary at 6.

systems, particularly in light of existing community health concerns and legacy environmental contamination.

**Recommendation No. 15: The Impact Statement must be updated to require a study of mercury on human health and the environment, which takes into account the proposed project and legacy contamination.**

## **I. Emergency Preparedness and Accountability**

As the purpose of the WSR is to facilitate mineral development in the Ring of Fire, the Friends submit that it is critical to consider the emergency response capacity of communities downstream of the proposed projects.

During our gatherings and amongst our members, we frequently hear about the severe flooding which occurred in 1985. In the Friends' previous submission, it was requested that lessons learned from the Flood of 1985 be expressly considered and adopted into the Guidelines' approach to emergency response.<sup>54</sup> The risks associated with breakup, including dyke erosion and the failure of infrastructure such as culverts, must be accounted for in the review of emergency preparedness. The impact of climate change on increasing the frequency and severity of flooding, as well as 'worst-case scenarios,' must also be considered.

In addition, the Friends reiterate concerns previously addressed in their previous submission that emergency preparedness measures not be decided upon without incorporating local knowledge from communities that have experience with breakup conditions, climate-related impacts, and accidents. The proponent should therefore provide opportunities for public input into the development of emergency response and preparedness measures, as well as mechanisms for ongoing public review and updates. These plans should be communicated to the public through a robust public awareness campaign. The effectiveness of emergency preparedness is directly tied to the level of awareness and preparedness of local residents before any accident or emergency.

The IS indicates that "Indigenous community members will have an active role in developing and implementing environmental management plans."<sup>55</sup> However, the IS does not clearly describe what this participation will look like or how emergency preparedness measures will be implemented or applied. Moreover, it does not indicate how emergency preparedness or response plans will be communicated to potentially affected communities.

The Friends submit that greater clarity is required regarding emergency preparedness measures to ensure potentially affected communities are adequately informed and prepared in the event of project-related emergencies.

---

<sup>54</sup> Guidelines at 22 and 26.

<sup>55</sup> IS at 17.

**Recommendation No. 16: Emergency preparedness planning, as outlined in the Impact Statement, should incorporate lessons learned from the 1985 Flood, including risks associated with seasonal breakup, dyke erosion, and the failure of infrastructure such as culverts. The impact of climate change on the frequency and severity of flooding, as well as 'worst-case scenarios', must also be taken into account.**

**Recommendation No. 17: The Proponents should be required to invite public feedback on emergency response and preparedness measures and ensure opportunities for ongoing public review and update. These plans should be communicated to the public through a robust public awareness campaign.**

### **III. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

We trust that our comments provide a voice for communities that stand to be directly affected, as well as for those not yet born. We look forward to further engagement on this project and ask to be notified and engaged on any future steps in the impact assessment process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized 'M' and 'K' enclosed in a circle, with a small mark above the circle.

---

Michel Koostachin  
Founder, Friends of the Attawapiskat River