NGO DWE WAANGIZID ANISHINAABE
One Anishinaabe Family

Debenjiged gii’saan anishinaaben akiing giibi dgwon gaadeni mnidoo waadiziwin.
Creator placed the Anishinaabe on the earth along with the gift of spirituality.

Shkode, nibi, aki, noodin, giibi dgosdoonan wii naagdowendmang maanpii Shkagmigaang.
Here on Mother Earth, there were gifts given to the Anishinaabe to look after, fire, water, earth and wind.

Debenjiged gii miinaan gechtwaa wendaagog Anishinaaben waa naagdoonjin ninda niizhwaaswi kino maadwinan.
The Creator also gave the Anishinaabe seven sacred gifts to guide them. They are:

Zaagidwin, Debwewin, Mnaadendmowin, Nbwaakaawin, Dbaadendiziwin, Gwekwaadziwin miinwa Aakedhewin.
Love, Truth, Respect, Wisdom, Humility, Honesty and Bravery.

Debenjiged kiimiingona dedbinwe wi naagdowendiwin.
Creator gave us sovereignty to govern ourselves.

Ka mnaadendanaa gaabi zhiwebag miinwaa nango megwaa ezhwebag, miinwa geyaabi waa ni zhiwebag.
We respect and honour the past, present and future.

(Preamble to the Anishinaabe Chi-Naaknigewin – as adopted by the Grand Council in June 2011)
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PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES:

The Anishinabek Nation (AN) - Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM), Lake Huron Regional Table (Table) took place November 21 and 22, 2017 at the AN Head Office on Nipissing First Nation. This was the third meeting of the Regional Table as a result of the implementation of a new regional engagement framework put in place by the AN. The Anishinabek Nation is divided into four regions, representatives of each member community of the Anishinabek Nation attend the Table corresponding to their Region. The purpose of this Table is to improve the ability of the Anishinabek communities and their members to engage with, and benefit from the development of minerals and mines in Anishinabek Territory. The Table meets quarterly and provides opportunities for information exchange, identification of issues of common concern, and development of solutions to challenges faced by Anishinabek communities in engaging with the minerals and mines sector. The Table is also a tool for relationship building in that it provides opportunities for Anishinabek community members to meet on a regular basis with MNDM staff and to exchange information and ideas. In this way, the Table also helps to improve accountability of all parties to one another through the establishment and tracking of action points that are reported on at the Table. The Table is attended by Anishinabek leaders, mining, minerals or economic development portfolio holders and technicians from the communities of the Region. The figure below denotes the Lake Huron Region of the Anishinabek Nation:
The work of the Regional Table helps to support other elements of the relationship between the AN and MNDM. Issues identified at a Regional Table that are of a technical nature or those that may impact more than one region can be sent to the AN-MNDM Joint Advisory Council (Advisory Council), where a smaller group made up of representatives from all four Anishinabek Regions and the MNDM can focus on exploring options and recommending actions. The Table also provides an important link between localized communities and the AN-MNDM Bi-lateral Leadership Forum. The following figure depicts the relationship between the Regional Table and other bodies that constitute the institutional relationship between the AN and MNDM:
14 First Nation leaders, portfolio holders and technicians from the Lake Huron Region attended the Table. These Anishinabek representatives were joined at the Table by staff from the Lands and Resources Department of the Anishinabek Nation. The Ministry of Northern Development and Mines was represented by a number of staff.

**FIRST NATION PARTICIPANTS:**
- Aleisa Boyer, Mississauga First Nation
- Andrew Manitowabi, Wiikwemkoong Unceded Territory
- Cate Pitawanakwat, Wiikwemkoong Unceded Territory
- Chelsea Bisaillon, Thessalon First Nation
- Daniella Baker, Wasausking First Nation
- Evelyn McLeod, Nipissing First Nation
- Hannah Burke, Wahnapeitae First Nation
- Kathleen Migwanabi, Whitefish River First Nation
- Leonard Genereux, Sheshegwaning First Nation
- Mike Chiblow, Thessalon First Nation
- Peter Nahwegahbo, Aundek Omni Kaning
- Randy Restoule, Dokis First Nation
- Ray Kagagins, Henvey Inlet First Nation
- Richard Perrault, Garden River First Nation

The following are those who were in attendance at the Table:

**ANISHINABEK NATION PARTICIPANTS:**
- Cameron Welch, Policy Analyst
- Tammy Desmoulin, Program Coordinator

**MNDM PARTICIPANTS:**
- Clayton Ralph, Senior Advisor North Bay
- Dean Touchette, Compliance Supervisor
- Karen Kettles, Mineral Exploration and Development Consultant
- Shannon Dennie, Mineral Exploration and Development Section
FIRST NATION CAUCUS

This meeting of the Table began with a First Nation Caucus. During this Caucus, First Nation representatives discussed their relationships with MNDM and mining companies. They also received an update on the mining and minerals related activities of Anishinabek Nation staff as well as activities of the Bi-lateral Leadership Forum and the AN-MNDM Joint Advisory Council (Advisory Council). The Caucus provided an important opportunity for AN representatives to openly discuss a number of issues and share experiences with one another without the presence of the representatives of the MNDM.

AN-MNDM ROUND TABLE

After the First Nation Caucus, Anishinabek Nation representatives were joined by staff from MNDM. The Table discussion consisted of two major elements. The first was a workshop on effective First Nation responses to letters from the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines. The second element was the discussion around the work that MNDM does to ensure compliance with the Mining Act.

INTRODUCTION TO NOTICE OF CLAIM

The MNDM kicked off the workshop with an overview of the mining sequence and the various points of contact between the Ministry and First Nations. The Table participants discussed their expectations around consultation. MNDM stressed that early exploration agreements can help to facilitate communication around community and proponent expectations. In addition, such agreements can assist communities in holding proponents accountable for what they have agreed to with the communities and the Ontario government. AN Table participants stressed that reaching out at such an early stage to the proponent without provincial requirements to do so and without a legal requirement for proponents to engage with First Nations, puts the onus on First Nations to reach out to claim holders. This was a concern for some participants at the Table due to the lack of human resources at some First Nations and past experience in dealing with proponents or claim holders. Table participants also stressed the need for foreign claim makers to become more familiar with the Anishinabek Nation and the rights held by member communities. MNDM representatives pointed out that foreign companies usually hire local people to conduct exploration on their behalf and this would continue with on-line staking and could be an area of opportunity for AN communities. AN representatives were concerned that they would have to spend additional time and resources educating claim makers and proponents about Indigenous and Treaty Rights in Canada.
MINERAL DEVELOPMENT ADVISORS

The discussion of the move toward on-line staking sparked a number of comments related to the need to increase the local capacity of AN communities to deal with foreign claim makers and an increase in the number of claims staked in AN territory once on-line staking commences in April of 2018. AN staff stressed that they can assist communities in their communications with claim makers. AN members of the Table called for those communities in the Lake Huron Region that are not currently served by a Mineral Development Advisor (MDA), to be served by one. MNDM representatives pointed out that MDA positions are based on the amount of permit or plan activity that a given First Nation is consulted on. AN staff stressed that they could potentially assist a group of communities in applying for an MDA position to service several communities. Many AN participants expressed frustration with the activity-based formula of MNDM. In the words of one AN representative, “I can’t see how MNDM has a formula and rules how we will get this money. We (First Nations), are all in the same position. We should all be accessing these dollars. If you want to have proper consultation, you need to allow us to have the capacity. If we go back to the wampum and treaties, it talks about sharing the land. Somehow you have to change those formula and rules.” Another AN representative put things plainly, “Our First Nations are already at the max with permits and letters. With the spike of activity with on-line staking, we are going to need more help.” The Table also decided to ask the Joint Advisory Council to work with MNDM to come up with some options for getting those AN communities, that are not currently supported by an MDA, some support. The Table decided to ask the Joint Advisory Council to work with MNDM to establish a mechanism for AN input into MNDM regulations as they are being considered.

QUESTION BY AN PARTICIPANT
How does the *Mining Act* relate to aggregates?

ANSWER FROM MNDM REPRESENTATIVE
Early exploration goes through the *Mining Act* and then it gets handed off to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.

PLANS AND PERMITS

The Table discussed those mining related exploration activities that require a Plan or Permit application to be submitted by the proponent to MNDM. In general, those activities that will have a lower potential impact on the environment are those that would require a Plan. A Permit is required for those activities that would have potentially higher levels of impact on the environment. MNDM pointed out that there are some exploration activities that do not require a Plan or Permit application with MNDM. These include those activities that are regulated by a provincial ministry.
other than MNDM. A Plan or Permit is not required for a project that is covered by a Closure Plan submitted to MNDM. Exploration work on patented land (land that was set aside for various groups i.e. Clergy men, war veterans to use), does not require a Plan or Permit. AN participants pointed out that patented lands were given by the Crown without proper consideration of the impacts on the ability of AN communities to exercise their Aboriginal and Treaty Rights on such lands and suggested that those patented lands that revert back to the Crown after a lapse in property tax should be made available to First Nations to exercise their rights. It was stressed that a mining claim only gives the holder rights to explore for minerals under the ground and that private land sales or leases only give surface rights to that parcel of land. Under the Mining Act, a claim holder is required to submit an exploration Plan or obtain an exploration Permit before undertaking the following kinds of early exploration activities:

The Table discussed the process associated with Plan and Permit applications. The Plan application process starts with the proponent sending a notice detailing planned exploration activities to MNDM. MNDM then generates and sends notice of planned activities to potentially impacted First Nation communities. MNDM then follows up with these First Nations who are given 30 calendar days to declare any impacts to their Aboriginal and Treaty rights related to
TABLE DISCUSSION:

The planned activity. If a First Nation declares concerns with the planned activities then said activities may be elevated to require a Permit. Such a Permit can place terms and conditions on activities and to alleviate or address site-specific issues or concerns. If MDNM does not receive any communication of interests, values or concerns from the First Nation after 30 days then the Plan becomes active. Once active, Plans are valid for 2 years.

The process associated with Permits differs from that of the Plan. For a Permit, MNDM receives notice from the claim holder of exploration activities that require a Permit. MNDM then sends notice to the impacted community(ies). The Permit application is then posted to the Ontario Environmental Registry for 30 days. During these 30 days, MNDM staff reaches out to First Nations to follow up with communities about the content of the Permit and the potential issues or concerns raised by the First Nation. MNDM may conduct or facilitate discussions between the First Nation and the proponent applying for the Permit. These discussions would set the stage for terms and conditions on the Permit for remedy or mitigation of site-specific concerns or issues. If the concerns or issues presented by the First Nation(s) cannot be addressed through these initial discussions then the Permit may be put on temporary hold so that these issues can be mutually addressed.

The group also explored best practices in dealing with a Plan or Permit when it is sent to the First Nation. When a First Nation receives a Plan or Permit application for review it is important to locate the proposed activities using the information and maps provided with the application. One AN Table participant lamented the lack of capacity to understand and process the letters that the First Nation receives, “I have been getting maps where all it shows is a colour on a grid. There is no name on it. There is only a number…The thing is, we don’t have the time to do all that stuff (going into CLAIMaps to identify the area in question).” It is important to note that when a notice of a Plan or Permit application is sent to a potentially impacted First Nation, that First Nation has 30 days to respond to the request to comment on the application. If maps that are more clear or additional information is needed then the First Nation should let MNDM know that the maps circulated are not satisfactory so that they can provide additional maps and information. It is also important to let MNDM know that you are checking your values against the proposed activities, this makes MNDM aware that your First Nation has values associated with the land in question. In such a situation, MNDM will contact the proponent letting them know that the First Nation has significant concerns or values in relation to the proposed exploration activities. It is also important to note that in circulating a Permit for consideration by a First Nation, its potential impacts to Aboriginal and Treaty rights and or cultural values of the potentially impacted First Nation(s) are important to share with MNDM. Following is an example of a notice of Claim Recording that is sent to a potentially impacted First Nation(s):
DATE
Dear Sir/Madam:

RE:  New Mining Claims recorded in proximity to your community

This is to inform you that ClaimHolderName has recorded mining claims in an area that we understand to be of interest to your community (map attached).

Claim Holder:   ClaimHolderName2
Address:   Address1
Town, Province:  Town, Prov
Postal Code:   PCode
Phone Number:  Phone
Email Address:  Email

We have provided the claim holder with contact information for your community, and we encourage communities and claim holders to contact one another and begin developing a working relationship as early as possible. Under the Mining Act, the claim holder is required to submit an exploration Plan or obtain an exploration Permit before some kinds of exploration activities can occur that would disturb the land and could adversely affect your community’s existing or asserted treaty or Aboriginal rights, in which case you will receive advance notice and will have an opportunity to comment before those kinds of exploration activities can begin. The attached Appendix describes these types of activities in more detail. We encourage you to let the claim holder and MNDM know as soon as possible if you have specific concerns about potential impacts to your community’s existing or asserted treaty or Aboriginal rights, so that appropriate steps can be taken to consider and address them.

The attached Appendix provides some additional information about the regulatory process for early exploration activities under Ontario’s Mining Act. If you would like more detailed information about the regulatory process or about particular mineral exploration activities, you can contact the regional Mineral Exploration and Development office at Contact Information

Yours truly,

Scott Cousineau
Provincial Mining Recorder
Ministry of Northern Development and Mines
Enclosure
MAP
The Table then turned to examine Permit specific terms and conditions. There are two types of terms and conditions that may serve to define or limit what, when or where activities can take place under the Permit. The first type are those that apply to all of the exploration activities listed on the Permit. The second type are those that only apply to specific activities listed on the Permit. Examples of terms and conditions include restrictions to an area of operation or restrictions on timing of operations. MNDM representatives positioned Permits as a tool to ensure the proponents are working together with First Nations to address and mitigate First Nation concerns. Some AN participants expressed frustration with the current system where they felt they (First Nations) have to chase companies to comply with First Nation protocols. In the words of one Table participant from the AN, “We (First Nations), don’t want to hinder the process. We are not stalling or hindering. It is the Ministry (MNDM) that is stalling and we get the blame for it. Really planning the consultation process out will benefit all parties. I know that First Nations have a stronger sense of environmental standards and more than the Ministry’s standards. The footprint at early exploration does matter. Even though it is not full blown, it is still a footprint.”

MNDM staff at the Table stressed that if First Nation communities are not satisfied with standards enforced by MNDM or have additional expectations of proponents then the First Nation should incorporate these standards and expectations into early exploration agreements between the First Nation and the proponent. Some AN representatives expressed support for an AN-wide consultation protocol or regional protocols. In the words of one AN participant, “We have different proponents coming in and meeting with us and the First Nations closest to us. We created a plan where the Chiefs and Councils will meet at one of the First Nations at one time to get the same information from the proponent. They all get the same information. It is a kind of Friendship Agreement between our First Nations. The issue in the past was that some stuff was said to one First Nation and was not said to another First Nation. The Friendship Agreement seems to be working for us.” In relation to such standards, agreements and terms and conditions on Permits, AN representatives stressed the need for local compliance monitors, a need that had been brought to previous meetings of the Table. AN staff stressed the need to work together with MNDM to explore options for funding such positions.

**QUESTION POSED BY AN REPRESENTATIVE**

Are there closure plans for early exploration activities?

**ANSWER FROM MNDM REPRESENTATIVE**

No there is not, but they have to follow Provincial Standards for early exploration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION POSED BY AN REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th>ANSWER FROM MNDM REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So the MNDM requires consultation with us at early exploration?</td>
<td>At the stage of the notice of claim, we encourage the proponent to consult with the First Nations that we have identified. It is at the Permit stage that consultation is required. We are seeing more and more proponents who are not willing to move forward without engaging with First Nation communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before we get a letter from MNDM or when we get the notice of claim, can we engage with the proponent?</td>
<td>Yes, we encourage that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s say that the proponent does not contact us. Is there a penalty for the proponent who does not contact us about the activities that they want to do?</td>
<td>Sometimes we can contact the proponent and get back to you or set up a meeting with the proponent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does MNDM consider species at risk?</td>
<td>At the early exploration level we do not require environmental studies and species at risk studies. The proponent must follow all other Ministry’s rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MINE REHABILITATION AND COMPLIANCE**

Day two of the meeting included a presentation and discussion lead by Dean Touchette from the Mine Rehabilitation and Compliance Section of MNDM. Dean went through the steps that are taken in completing an inspection of an exploration site.

The first step is a survey of all available information on the site and associated permitted activities is undertaken in the office. During this research a number of questions are answered. These include: What is the Permit number? What is the expiry date of the Permit? Does this person hold the qualifications for the Permit? Has the person completed the Mining Act Awareness Program in the last 5 years? What are they planning on doing? What are the conditions on the Permit? Who is the Permit holder? What is the annual work Plan? What is the location and area of Permit activities? It is also important at this stage to determine land tenure as the tenure determines what a person can or cannot do on that land such as being allowed to put a gate up at the site or not.
Step 2 is a physical site inspection. During this inspection a GPS waypoint is taken to ensure proper location. An assessment of any hazards at the site is undertaken. This stage is important in that the inspection must rely solely on direct observation and not on hearsay. Any risks are then identified and the site is inspected according to the Provincial standards that include the site be maintained at all times in a clean and safe condition and that roads and trails leading to the exploration site must not be obstructed.

Step 3 is report writing. At this stage, a report is written by the compliance officer detailing the results of the investigation. It is important to note that if a claim was made prior to November 1, 2012 then there may not be a Permit associated with the claim and thus the Provincial Standards do not apply. These standards cannot be retroactively applied.

Step 4 is Compliance Follow up. If a problem has been identified during the inspection then dates for compliance are set as a result of the non-compliant items identified. Section 78.5 of the Mining Act provides the author to require the exploration activity to cease until the contravention is addressed to the satisfaction of a Director and the order to cease activity has been revoked.

**SYSTEM FOR ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT ANALYSIS AND RETRIEVAL AND MINING COMPANY INFORMATION**

The Table discussed the use of the SEDAR securities filing system. www.sedar.com is the official site that provides access to public securities products and information that are filed by companies with provincial securities regulatory authorities across the county. This database provides a wealth of information on companies listed on the stock exchange including many mining companies operating in Ontario. This is a good place to start when trying to gather information about companies that may be active in Anishinabek territory.
ONTARIO PROVINCIAL STANDARDS FOR EARLY EXPLORATION

Inspections are based in part on Ontario Provincial Standards for Early Exploration. The following are those standards:

PART I - REQUIREMENTS FOR CARRYING OUT EXPLORATION PLAN ACTIVITIES

Early Exploration Proponents carrying out Exploration Plan Activities shall comply with the following requirements:

1.0 Geophysical Surveys
1.1 Where any geophysical survey involving a generator is being conducted, signs must be posted at exploration site access points to warn other persons of a potential electrical hazard and must remain in place for the duration of the survey activity.

2.0 Line Cutting
2.1 All line cutting is to be done using hand-held tools.

3.0 Mechanized Drilling
3.1 The following requirements apply whenever the drill rig is removed and taken to a new location:
   3.1.1 Capping and Sealing of Drill Holes
       (a) if the drill hole is artesian or encounters underground mine openings or solution cavities the drill hole must be either,
           (i) sealed at the surface and into the upper bedrock by grouting the upper 30 metres of bedrock or the entire depth of the hole, whichever is the lesser, or
           (ii) capped with a screw-on or bolt on cap
       (b) if the drill hole is drilled through the bed of a water body, the drill hole must be sealed at the surface and into the upper bedrock by grouting the upper 30 metres of bedrock or the entire depth of the hole, whichever is the lesser, and the drill casing removed
   3.1.2 Marking Drill Holes
       (a) all drill hole locations where casings are not removed are marked with durable reflective markers which are clearly visible in all seasons.

3.2 Drill Core
Drill Core samples must be stored not less than 30 metres from any permanent water bodies or waterways.

4.0 Mechanized Surface Stripping
4.1 All stripped overburden must be stockpiled on site in a safe and stable manner, separately from waste rock.
PART II - REQUIREMENTS FOR CARRYING OUT EXPLORATION PERMIT ACTIVITIES

Early Exploration Proponents carrying out Exploration Permit Activities shall comply with the following requirements:

1.0 Mechanized Drilling

1.1 The following requirements apply whenever the drill rig is removed and taken to a new location:

1.1.1 Capping and Sealing of Drill Holes

(a) if the drill hole is artesian or encounters underground mine openings or solution cavities the drill hole must be either,

   (i) sealed at the surface and into the upper bedrock by grouting the upper 30 metres of bedrock or the entire depth of the hole, whichever is the lesser, or

   (ii) capped with a screw-on or bolt on cap

(b) if the drill hole is drilled through the bed of a water body, the drill hole must be sealed at the surface and into the upper bedrock by grouting the upper 30 metres of bedrock or the entire depth of the hole, whichever is the lesser, and the drill casing removed

1.1.2 Marking Drill Holes

(a) all drill hole locations where casings are not removed are marked with durable reflective markers which are clearly visible in all seasons.

1.2 Drill Core samples must be stored not less than 30 metres from any permanent water bodies or waterways.

2.0 Mechanized Surface Stripping

2.1 All stripped overburden must be stockpiled on site in a safe and stable manner, separately from waste rock.

3.0 Pitting and Trenching

3.1 The following requirements apply where a pit wall or vertical man-made rock face is greater than three metres in height:

   a) fencing that is at the minimum a high visibility barrier fence of at least one metre in height must be installed with a setback of at least 3 metres from the brow of the rock face or pit wall,

   b) signs stating “Danger – Open Pit”, measuring at least 35 centimetres by 25 centimetres, made of durable weatherproof material must be posted in suitable locations to warn other persons of the potential hazard, and

   c) pits must be sloped to provide at least one ramp as a point of egress.

3.2 Disturbed bedrock must be stockpiled on site in a safe and stable manner.
PART III - REQUIREMENTS FOR REHABILITATION OF EXPLORATION PLAN AND EXPLORATION PERMIT ACTIVITIES

Early Exploration Proponents who have carried out Exploration Plan Activities or Exploration Permit Activities shall comply with the following requirements upon completion of the activity and in any event, prior to the expiry of the applicable Exploration Plan or Exploration Permit.

1.0 Drilling

1.1 Capping and Sealing Drill Holes
Drill holes must be sealed at surface and into the upper bedrock by grouting the upper 30 metres of bedrock or the entire depth of the hole, whichever is the lesser if the drill holes meet any of the following criteria:
   a) they produce water (artesian).
   b) they encounter underground mine openings or solution cavities.

1.2. Marking Drill Holes Where Casings Left
All drill hole locations where casings are not removed must be marked with durable reflective markers which are clearly visible in all seasons.

1.3 Drilling Fluids and Cuttings
All drilling fluids, cuttings and mud if left on site must be contained and must not be left less than 30 metres from any permanent water body or waterway.

1.4 Drill Core
Where drill core is left on the exploration site, it must be cross-piled in an orderly manner to a height not exceeding 1.5 metres and not less than 30 metres from any permanent water body or waterway.

2.0 Stripping

2.1 Disturbed overburden must be contoured to a stable angle of repose.
2.2 Stripped areas if not backfilled must be contoured to a stable angle of repose.

3.0 Pitting and Trenching

3.1 All pit walls or man-made vertical rock faces greater than three metres in height must be backfilled or contoured to a stable angle of repose.
3.2 All pits with walls greater than three metres in height if not backfilled must be sloped to provide at least one ramp as a point of egress.
3.3 Disturbed bedrock must be stockpiled on site in a safe and stable manner.
ABANDONED MINE SITES

The Table discussed abandoned mines. It was clear that there is a need to clean up these sites and the Table discussed possibilities for First Nation opportunities related to the rehabilitation of hazards associated with these sites. Decisions about which mines to rehabilitate first were said to be based on the level of risk that these sites present to the general public. The Table also discussed how the Province funds cleanup of abandoned mines through the financial assurance provided by the mining company through the Closure Plan for the mine that is now done before a mine is established. The Table noted that there are almost 5000 legacy sites in Ontario that need to be cleaned up. The MNRM representative pointed out that with limited staff numbers, MNRM is looking into using drones to do some inspection work. The AN members of the Table suggested that it would be good for members of their community to receive drone training along with MNRM staff. MNRF was identified as a possible source of training. The Table also discussed the need for the AN communities to revive mobilization and demobilization notices so that they can know what the companies operating on their territory are doing. The Table also discussed the possibility of the AN establishing a conservation authority to take advantage of money generated by fines and other orders related to environmental degradation.

**QUESTION FROM ANISHINABEK PARTICIPANT**

If someone from our communities have a concern about compliance what should we do?

**ANSWER FROM MNRM REPRESENTATIVE**

You can contact anyone at MNRM and it will come to us.

Let’s say that a First Nation did not anticipate that mineral exploration of a given company would impact their Aboriginal or Treaty rights. What happens when these rights are impacted in an unanticipated way?

There is always that opportunity for new information. If it is new knowledge and new information we have to consider that too.
Figure 1 Table participants discuss abandoned mine rehabilitation
SUMMARY:

This meeting of the Lake Huron Regional Table was a success. The lively and informative discussion and exchange of information was of value to both the AN and MNDM. The questions and points of discussion are illustrative of the utility of the Table for improving relationships and understanding between the AN and MNDM.

ACTION POINTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY(IES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach out to the AN communities to ensure that the proper people are</td>
<td>MNDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receiving the notices from MNDM including the Notice of Claim Recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGS to share areas of high mineral potential information with AN</td>
<td>MNDM/OGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential funding sources for community compliance (Permits and</td>
<td>AN and MNDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other agreements) monitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design template letters for different levels of response</td>
<td>AN with potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNDM input into final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Joint Advisory Council to create mechanism for AN input into</td>
<td>MNDM and AN to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations</td>
<td>through Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Joint Advisory Council to ensure that all AN communities are</td>
<td>MNDM and AN to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serviced by an MDA.</td>
<td>through Joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish drone training opportunities for AN communities along with</td>
<td>MNDM and AN (possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNDM</td>
<td>work with MNRF to get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on Little Current stockpile</td>
<td>Dan of MNDM to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AN to determine the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nature of and plans for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the stockpile (Done by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNDM via AN. Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communicated to Table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that AN communities receive mobilization and demobilization notices</td>
<td>MNDM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Topics for Further Discussion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities for AN to establish a conservation authority to capture some of the fines leveled by the Ontario government in relation of environmental damages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities for AN benefits from mine reclamation and procurement opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of inspection reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of experiences with consultation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of Friendship Agreement related to consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mission of the Lands & Resources Department is to foster a better quality of life by ensuring access to natural resources in support of the goals, principles and values of the Anishinabek Nation.