

SUBJECT AREA: First Nations, Aboriginal

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-002

QUESTION:

Further to question # PFN-IR-002, and use of the term ‘First Nations’ in Chapter 4.1 and ‘Aboriginal’ in section 6.3.3, does Manitoba Hydro make a distinction between Metis and First Nations, and if so, how are these two communities distinguished.

RESPONSE:

- 1 When engaging with communities, Manitoba Hydro seeks to understand and respect
- 2 terminology preferences held by individual communities and organizations. The term “First
- 3 Nations” refers to one of three distinct groups recognized as “Aboriginal” in the *Constitution*
- 4 *Act* of 1982. The other two distinct groups characterized as “Aboriginal” are the Métis and the
- 5 Inuit. There are over 600 First Nation communities in Canada, with each represented by their
- 6 own First Nation Government.

- 7 It is Manitoba Hydro’s understanding that a Metis person is an individual who self-identifies as
- 8 Metis, is distinct from one of the other two recognized aboriginal groups in Canada, can trace
- 9 his or her lineage to an historic Metis community and is accepted as Metis by the broader Metis
- 10 community. In Manitoba, the Metis community is represented by the Manitoba Metis
- 11 Federation.

SUBJECT AREA: First Nations, Engagement

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-003

QUESTION:

What were 'Key Person Interviews'? How were 'Key Persons' selected or identified? Was a record kept of 'Key Person Interviews'? Was there a standard format or protocol for 'Key Person Interviews'? Did Hydro representatives identify 'Key Persons' for First Nation or Metis communities? Were 'Key Person' interviews conducted by Hydro representatives for First Nation or Metis persons? Were Hydro representatives present for 'Key Person' interviews? Were First Nation's or Metis' communities informed of requirements or protocols for 'Key Person' interviews? And if not, how were First Nation's or Metis' interviews seen as equivalent to Key Person interviews?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Key Person Interviews, or 'KPIs,' were conducted with representatives identified from various
- 2 organizations, agencies and stakeholders involved in agriculture, environment, recreation,
- 3 business and industry, resource use, health and emergency services to supplement secondary
- 4 baseline information.
- 5 Yes, records were kept for KPIs.
- 6 Yes, there was a standard format for conducting KPIs specific to each particular technical
- 7 specialty. For example, the wildlife and wildlife habitat KPIs were provided with one of several
- 8 questionnaires appropriate to their area of expertise (see Appendix C of the Wildlife and Wildlife
- 9 Habitat Technical Data Report).
- 10 No, Manitoba Hydro did not conduct KPIs with First Nation or Metis representatives. It is
- 11 Manitoba Hydro's understanding that the MMF and First Nations generally prefer to conduct
- 12 interviews with their members directly rather than have Manitoba Hydro staff conduct
- 13 interviews with their members. As such, any key person interviews undertaken with members

14 of First Nations or the MMF were undertaken at the discretion of the MMF or First Nations
15 through the self-directed studies. Please see PFN-IR-003.

16 No, Manitoba Hydro representatives were not present for interviews conducted by First
17 Nations or the MMF.

18 No, FNMEP communities and organizations were not specifically informed of requirements or
19 protocols for KPIs. Each community or organization was invited to use methods or protocols of
20 their preference. Manitoba Hydro shared materials in Appendix 4F of Chapter 4, which includes
21 ideas on specific questions that could be helpful to inform the project.

22 Manitoba Hydro did not have an equivalency process for information received through self-
23 directed studies with FNMEP communities and organizations or KPIs. One set of information
24 was not valued more or less than another. Information was included in the analysis if it
25 contributed to the discussion on that particular topic.

SUBJECT AREA: Traditional Land Use

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-005

QUESTION:

‘As described in Table 11-6 Manitoba Hydro will consider non-chemical vegetation management in clearly identified sensitive sites that contain plants that are of importance to Aboriginal harvesters.’

The use of the word ‘consider’ implies that other options besides non-chemical vegetation management will be considered for sensitive sites. What are the criteria for choosing between options for sensitive sites?

Does the identification of sensitive sites include awareness of drainage or precipitation, or other processes that would lead to contamination of sensitive sites, or is it simply restricted to the narrow geography of the sites themselves? What are the standards for buffers?

How will Manitoba Hydro use adaptive management to consider non chemical vegetation management for sensitive sites that are identified during operation of the MMTP?

RESPONSE:

- 1 The criteria used to select the treatment method is based on a multitude of factors including:
- 2 • Type of vegetation, height, density;
- 3 • Existing land use;
- 4 • Aesthetics;
- 5 • Proximity of water sources, bodies of water and environmentally sensitive sites;
- 6 • The possibility of adverse impacts to wildlife, fish, surrounding land, workers and
- 7 adjacent residents;
- 8 • Safety, security and economic impacts;
- 9 • Timing of treatment including reduced risk timing windows for treatment options, such
- 10 as riparian areas due to fish spawning windows, calving periods for moose and caribou
- 11 or concerns around bird nesting areas;

- 12 • Existing soil types, weed species present, objectives of control, and how these relate to
13 the suitability of the particular methods being considered;
- 14 • Site accessibility; and
- 15 • The consequences of no treatment.

16 The identification of sensitive sites includes awareness of environmental variables such as
17 drainage, slope, and precipitation, but not necessarily climatic extremes such as excessive
18 rainfall, and wind events. Manitoba Hydro's setbacks for herbicide control is 30m around water
19 bodies, and 15m for plant species at risk and plant gathering sites for hose and handgun
20 application; for basal treatments (directly applied to tree stems) there are no setbacks
21 currently. Sensitive sites may be identified during operations by Manitoba Hydro staff,
22 Manitoba Conservation Data Center, public and/or indigenous communities. These sites will be
23 validated and the Operational Environmental Protection Plan updated on a continuous basis.

SUBJECT AREA: List of 3 Human Health Risk

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-007

QUESTION:

Lines 6 and 7: 'Project effects on sociological and cultural determinants on health are assessed in other sections of the EIS.' What sections? Please specify.

Lines 14 and 15: 'Traditional knowledge relating to country food harvesting ... was used...' Please identify source of 'traditional knowledge' specifically – was it FNEMP, ATK or other?

RESPONSE:

- 1 The Project effects on sociological and cultural determinants of health are assessed in Chapter
- 2 19 of the EIS: Assessment of Potential Social Effects on Community Health and Well-Being,
- 3 Section 19.4.1.5 – Stress and Mental Wellbeing. Effects pathways related to human health are
- 4 discussed in Chapter 11: Assessment of Potential Environmental Effects on Traditional Land and
- 5 Resource Use Section 11.3.2.2 Potential Environmental Effects, Effect Pathways and
- 6 Measurable Parameters; 11.5.2.1 Pathways for Change in Plant Harvesting.

- 7 Concerns related to potential effects of herbicide usage on the plants harvested as food or
- 8 medicine and/or animals that are harvested as country food were raised through both the
- 9 FNMEP as well as through ATK studies. During the FNMEP, Peguis First Nation raised concerns
- 10 regarding effects on traditional medicines. Black River First Nation, Swan Lake First Nation, and
- 11 Long Plain First Nation (2015), Sagkeeng First Nation (2015), and Roseau River Anishinabe First
- 12 Nation (2015) also all noted concerns through their ATK studies regarding the potential effects
- 13 of herbicide usage on the plants harvested as food or medicine and/or animals that are
- 14 harvested as country foods. The information gathered during the engagement process also
- 15 identified concerns relating to the effects of EMF on local plants and animals and the effect that
- 16 this may have on country food quality and quantity.

SUBJECT AREA: Pending First Nations

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-008

QUESTION:

Regarding the updated status table on CEC-IR-021 Response, Peguis First Nation TLU study is listed as having submitted final report on June 2015. Is this accurate? Isn't Peguis document a draft or interim report? The updated status table on CEC-IR-021 indicates that no further updates have taken place since Dakota Plains Wapeton in September 2016, and Sagkeeng in March 2016. Is this correct? There were no other updates in 2016? And none in 2017?

RESPONSE:

- 1 A final report was submitted to Manitoba Hydro on October 26, 2015, not June 2015 as
- 2 indicated in CEC-IR-021. A document entitled "*Report to Peguis First Nation and Manitoba*
- 3 *Hydro Peguis First Nation Land Use and Occupancy Interview Project For the Manitoba –*
- 4 *Minnesota Transmission Project*" was submitted in June of 2015. We understand this document
- 5 was draft. Since that time, there have been concerns shared by Peguis First Nation about
- 6 sharing spatial files associated with the final report. Manitoba Hydro has not filed the Peguis
- 7 First Nation Final Report and will not until concerns are addressed. A letter was sent on June 30,
- 8 2016 asking for clarification about the nature of Peguis First Nation's concerns. This letter was
- 9 re-sent in October 14, 2016. A follow up email asking the same question was sent March 29,
- 10 2017. At this time, Manitoba Hydro has not received a response to this letter or any of the
- 11 follow up requests.

- 12 Manitoba Hydro received the Manitoba Metis Federation's Land Use and Occupancy Study on
- 13 March 8, 2017 and will be filing it in due course.

SUBJECT AREA: Pending First Nations

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-008

QUESTION:

Lines 2 and 3: 11.1.3 refers to eleven First Nations, the MMF and four aboriginal organizations. What were the organizations specifically? If they were identified based on engagement in previous projects, which projects?

RESPONSE:

- 1 The four Aboriginal organizations referred to are the Aboriginal Chamber of Commerce,
- 2 Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council and Southern Chiefs Organization.
- 3 Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council and Southern Chiefs Organization
- 4 have mandates in the Project area and the Aboriginal Chamber of Commerce was identified
- 5 based on their engagement in the Bipole III Transmission Project.

SUBJECT AREA: TLRU and VC

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-009

QUESTION:

Line 9 and 10: ‘The TLRU included information from other VC chapters....’ Please specify the chapters?

Line 12: ‘... Assessment authors ‘integrated’ effects. Please identify authors? Are CV’s available? Will they be provided? Provide 3 examples of how effects were integrated by assessment authors. Are the assessment authors also discipline leads? If not then please explain the difference in the responsibility of assessment authors and discipline or chapter leads?’

RESPONSE:

1 Chapter 11 included information on species, habitats, resources, and mitigations from Chapter
2 8: Fish and Fish Habitat, Chapter 9: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat, Chapter 10: Vegetation and
3 Wetlands; Chapter 12: Heritage Resources and Chapter 16: Land and Resource Use.

4 The personnel that contributed to the EIS are listed in the “List of Key Personnel” included in
5 the Executive Volume of the EIS.

6 Examples of the integration of knowledge to effects assessments of other VCs include:

7 • Chapter 8 Section 8.1.2 p. 8-4

8 ○ *“A review of existing data on traditional land use conducted by Metis within the*
9 *Project area reported that fishing near the confluence of the Red and La Salle*
10 *rivers has historically been important. Fish were abundant there, and species*
11 *fished included burbot (*Lota lota*), jackfish (northern pike, *Esox lucius*), carp*
12 *(*Cyprinus carpio*) and catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*) (North/South Consultants*
13 *2014). This was incorporated into the assessment as areas that support CRA*
14 *fisheries and are within the scope of the federal Fisheries Act. Peguis fishing*

15 *activities were described to occur year around, with angling and net fishing being*
16 *the most common methods. Roseau River First Nation stated their activities are*
17 *practised as sport because it is thought that the rivers are contaminated with*
18 *poisons such as mercury (i.e., any fish that are caught are not consumed). It was*
19 *also noted that a decrease in fish spawning has been observed over the last*
20 *decade (Roseau River Anishinabe First Nation 2015)."*

21 • Chapter 10 Section 10.3.2.1.5 p. 10-23

22 ○ *"The assessment of potential Project effects on the abundance and distribution of*
23 *traditional use plant species focused on representative species identified during*
24 *the FNMEP, specifically the self-directed ATK study undertaken jointly by Black*
25 *River First Nation, Long Plain First Nation and Swan Lake First Nation (2015),*
26 *which included a list of traditional use plant species identified by community*
27 *members during a survey of the RAA (Table 10-2). This list was cross-referenced*
28 *with a list of plant species identified during field studies for the Project (Map*
29 *Series 10-200 – Traditional Use Plant Species Observed). Potential Project effects*
30 *on traditional use plant species were assessed by evaluating the abundance of*
31 *these species, and the potential alteration of associated land cover classes in the*
32 *RAA."*

33 • Chapter 12 Section 12.1.2.3 p. 12-6

34 ○ *"The Black River First Nation, Long Plain First Nation, Swan Lake First Nation*
35 *traditional knowledge report indicated that between Marchand and Sandilands,*
36 *there was an area where people camped and hunted (Black River et al. 2015).*
37 *This area was also a place where First Nations would gather during specific times*
38 *of the year. The traditional knowledge studies also identified the area south of*
39 *Spur Woods Siding as a ceremonial and gathering location. Spur Woods Siding*
40 *was located along the former Ridgeville to Pine rail spur line.*

41 *Members of Swan Lake First Nation identified the Assiniboine River and Red River*
42 *crossings within the Existing Corridor as areas of potential heritage resources*
43 *related to First Nation camps and Metis farmsteads"*

44 Discipline Leads are subject matter experts who typically contribute to writing by guiding and
45 advising authors and providing quality review while the contributing VC authors typically
46 include the field practitioners who conducted the baseline studies.

SUBJECT AREA: **Assessment of ATK**

REFERENCE: **PFN-IR-0010**

QUESTION:

Lines 4 and 5: Are any secondary sources used but not cited in section 11.11? Or to put it another way, is section 11.11 a complete and thorough listing of all secondary sources referenced, relied upon or used?

RESPONSE:

- 1 To the best of Manitoba Hydro's knowledge, Section 11.11 is a complete and thorough listing of
- 2 secondary sources referenced.

SUBJECT AREA: Assessment of ATK

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-011

QUESTION:

Please explain the term 'discipline lead' – is this a formal position or role? If so, clarify. Line 16 suggests that 'Assessment leads' were responsible for final conclusions, is this correct? Are Discipline Leads identified in the documentation? If not, why not?

The terms 'assessment professionals', 'VC discipline lead', 'discipline lead', 'VC leads' and 'assessment leads' all refer to the same position, interchangeably? Correct?

At line 18, it is stated that 'The FNMEP process included the ATK studies...' ATK studies are only from and for specified communities. Is there any separation or identification of FNMEP information from communities which have not tendered ATK studies? Otherwise there is a concern that information from ATK studies are being generalized and applied beyond the scope intended.

RESPONSE:

1 'VC discipline lead', 'discipline lead', 'VC leads' and 'assessment leads' are generally staff of
2 consultants or Manitoba Hydro involved in the preparation of the assessment who have
3 experience in a particular field of expertise or the field of environmental assessment. These
4 staff typically contributed by writing, advising and providing quality review. The personnel that
5 contributed to the EIS are listed in the "List of Key Personnel" included in the Executive Volume
6 of the EIS.

7 Yes, there is information from communities included in the MMTP EIS that does not originate
8 from an ATK study. When engagement outcomes are described in valued component chapters,
9 the source of the information was identified. When ATK information was included, the relevant
10 ATK study was identified.

SUBJECT AREA: Secondary Sources

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-012

QUESTION:

Lines 3, 4 and 5: What specifically are the time frames? What specifically are the geographic scopes? Was there any effort to integrate or recognise the effect of time frames or geographic scopes? For instance, studies that refer to moose populations in the RAA in the 1990's would need to be considered in light of the collapse of moose populations in the area in the current day. What is Manitoba Hydro policy regarding combining sets of data from different periods or points in time and explanation this has been done and how it affects interpretation of the data, and impacts on the project ?

RESPONSE:

- 1 As stated in Round 1, the references provided in the EIS, and the North/South report, extend over a
- 2 variety of time frames and geographic scopes. Manitoba Hydro has not created a spreadsheet
- 3 which sets out the timeframe and geographic scope for each reference. As such, there isn't a
- 4 document to provide.

- 5 Manitoba Hydro did look at trends in the condition of focal species over time and in locations
- 6 relevant to the MMTP, if available. The effects of past and current projects contribute to the
- 7 baseline conditions upon which Project effects are assessed and any trends that were available
- 8 were considered when characterizing the condition of focal species and determining the baseline
- 9 conditions.

- 10 Manitoba Hydro does not have a policy regarding combining sets of data from different periods or
- 11 points in time.

SUBJECT AREA: Adverse Effects

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-014

QUESTION:

The response set out is not clear. Perhaps an example can be provided to illustrate how a ‘narrative description can provide context that may not otherwise be captured.’

Also, how are beliefs or narrative descriptions integrated into or compared with effects characterization. Again, an example might be helpful.

RESPONSE:

- 1 The traditional knowledge studies provided include a description of effects from the
- 2 perspective of the community. Manitoba Hydro refers to these as a narrative description. For
- 3 example, Sagkeeng First Nation eloquently describes the challenge with using a Valued
- 4 Component based approach to assessment when they write: *“To members, the lands and*
- 5 *waters are indivisible and anything that is done to either will have far reaching affects for all*
- 6 *life.”* This is a challenge faced by assessments across Canada and to address this challenge,
- 7 Manitoba Hydro continues to support traditional knowledge studies and has moved towards
- 8 broader valued components for this assessment.

SUBJECT AREA: Oral Histories

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-015

QUESTION:

Oral histories were included as part of some ATK studies. Which ATK studies included oral histories and were the oral histories used? Alternately which oral histories from which ATK studies were referenced or relied upon?

Did Hydro representatives conduct any oral histories outside of ATK studies, as part of FNEMP or apart from FNEMP? If so, please specify.

Were Hydro representatives present for any Oral Histories, either by or through ATK or through other studies?

Is Hydro aware of and does it subscribe to the standards of the Tri-Council for interviews with Aboriginal Peoples in Canada? Is the team working on MMTP aware that Manitoba Hydro confirmed it relied on these Tri Council standards for Keeyask interviews of aboriginal persons?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Roseau River Anishinabe First Nation included oral histories in their ATK study and report. Oral
- 2 history was also part of Black River First Nation, Long Plain First Nation and Swan Lake First
- 3 Nation's ATK study. Manitoba Hydro did not conduct any oral histories as part of the FNMEP or
- 4 apart from FNMEP for MMTP. Oral histories were conducted at the discretion of the
- 5 communities involved. As such, methodological preferences were at the direction of the
- 6 individual communities or organizations, and not Manitoba Hydro.

- 7 Manitoba Hydro representatives were not present for any Oral histories either by or through
- 8 ATK or through other studies for the MMTP.

- 9 Manitoba Hydro supports standards that are respectful of the persons from whom interviews
- 10 are sought. During the Keeyask hearings, a consultant for Manitoba Hydro confirmed that the
- 11 Tri-council standards were included in the consultant's methodology for the interview of

- 12 Aboriginal persons for the Keeyask Project. The work referred to by the consultant was
- 13 separate from the work undertaken by communities on the Keeyask project.

SUBJECT AREA: **Vegetation Herbicide Management**

REFERENCE: **PFN-IR-017**

QUESTION:

Line 9: Reference to 'Chapter Authors' are these persons identified? Is this a defined position or role? Is this the same as 'Discipline Leader' or 'Assessment Leader.'

Lines 7 through 11: Regarding 'continuous' or ongoing herbicide use, can you clarify the criteria for vegetation management and herbicides during the construction phase? What are the criteria for vegetation management decisions during the post-construction period? Are the criteria for sensitive sites in place from the start of construction with respect to not using herbicides?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Chapter Authors is a synonym for Discipline Leader. There is no criteria for herbicide use during
- 2 construction, as Manitoba Hydro will not use herbicides for clearing. The criteria for vegetation
- 3 management decisions during post construction are described in CEC-IR-059 and its
- 4 attachment. Yes, the criteria for sensitive sites are in place from the start of construction with
- 5 respect to not using herbicides. The establishment of sensitive sites is not static, and should
- 6 new sites be identified through pre-construction, construction or operation phases, new
- 7 sensitive sites can be considered.

SUBJECT AREA: Recreational Access Users

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-018

QUESTION:

Line 3 and 4: 'professional judgement' – whose professional judgement?

Also, to clarify – the position that increased access for recreational users is a benefit from MMTP is the position of Manitoba Hydro for the CEC, or simply the position of the Discipline Leader or Chapter Author?

Who is responsible for this conclusion about this benefit from MMTP?

RESPONSE:

1 Professional judgment is the judgment of those topic-experts involved in the preparation of the
2 assessment, Manitoba Hydro, and consultants.

3 Noble (2015) describes professional judgment when he writes

4 *“Judgment underlies many EIA tools and is arguably the most commonly used tool in EIA*
5 *for impact prediction. As suggested by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP*
6 *2002), the successful application of many EIA methods relies heavily on the nature and*
7 *quality of expert judgment.” (pg 55).*

8 Sometimes a potential effect of a project will be seen as positive from one perspective, and
9 negative from another. Some people engaged in the Project view the increased access provided
10 with the Project as a positive because it allows for increased harvesting or recreational
11 opportunities. This effect is viewed as a negative by others. The MMTP EIS has conservatively
12 assessed the effect as negative, but has included both perspectives in the discussion.

SUBJECT AREA: Assessment of Effects

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-019

QUESTION:

Lines 3 and 4: 'These activities are understood to occur on crown land...' Source for this assertion?

Lines 10, 11, 12 and 25: 'As identified in other nearby Manitoba Hydro rights of way....' Which rights of way? Were disclosure of these rights of ways, assessments or studies thereto part of the Environmental study? Are these disclosed?

Line 31: What specifically are the 'specified areas' referenced – the entire right of way? Construction area? Can you clarify the term? Regarding the 'specified areas' and the assertion that these are not traversed by the final preferred route, does this comment take into account the activities and impacts of construction and the construction period?

How will Manitoba Hydro take into account the migration of sensitive sites over time, and fulfill all of its commitments and intentions regarding the EPP and its several sub plans?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Lines 3 and 4: Manitoba Hydro heard concern throughout the FNMEP process about the
- 2 potential effects of routing on Crown lands where First Nations and Metis can exercise their
- 3 rights. Please see Chapter 4 and Appendix A of the EIS for more information.

- 4 Lines 10, 11, 12 and 25: The other right-of-way is M602F. Rare plant surveys were conducted in
- 5 areas of native vegetation for SAR and SOCC for the Project. The surveys (95 sites within the
- 6 RAA, including 43 early plant and 52 rare plant surveys) were completed for both the preferred
- 7 and alternative routes to aid in the final route selection. Late rare plants surveys (six sites,
- 8 including three at towers and three on the transmission line) were also completed on an
- 9 existing transmission line, M602F, located in deciduous forest, mixedwood forest and

10 coniferous forest adjacent to the Project within the RAA. The surveys on M602F are disclosed in
11 the Vegetation and Wetlands Technical Data Report.

12 Line 31: Specified areas not traversed by the final preferred route include Watson P. Davidson
13 WMA and Spur Woods WMA. Through the FNMEP, Roseau River Anishinabe First Nation
14 identified the areas around and between the Watson P. Davidson and Spur Woods WMAs as
15 areas of concern with respect to berry picking and gathering practices and noted concerns
16 about road access and effects on medicinal plants surrounding the Watson P. Davidson WMA
17 and south of the Spur Woods WMA. The ATKS Management Team also indicated a preference
18 to route through disturbed land. Concerns were expressed regarding the area Zone 3, which
19 includes Marchand, to south of the Watson P. Davidson Wildlife Management Area: “The
20 potential of impacting heritage, historical, cultural and sacred sites is deemed to be very high in
21 Zone 3”. The team’s feedback was considered in the transmission line routing process. The
22 team also shared concerns “about a weke patch, cedar bog, harvesting area and abandoned
23 town area near Marchand”. Again, the team’s feedback regarding the area was considered in
24 the transmission line routing process.

25 Manitoba Hydro’s Environmental Protection Program monitors the right-of-way for additional
26 sensitive sites and will apply the appropriate mitigation measures based on the nature of the
27 site and potential effects.

SUBJECT AREA: Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-022

QUESTION:

Regarding 15 km buffer zone, is this 15 km total, or 15 km on each side? Is the 15 km buffer zone standard for Hydro across the province? How was 15 km arrived at? What is the total width of the project area corridor including the right of way? Are construction areas, burrow pits, equipment areas, etc all within the 15 km buffer zone?

Regarding reference to importance of listed species ‘.... Noted by some First Nation communities...’ which communities?

Regarding species – did the assessment referred to include beaver, muskrat, rabbit, raccoon, fox, wolverine, badger, and other mammal species of concern to trappers and aboriginal people, or any other mammal species apart from the named ones?

Did Manitoba Hydro consider species listed by the CDC as relevant for assessment of the MMTP?

RESPONSE:

- 1 The RAA for Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat is 15 km on each side of the transmission line, for a
- 2 total RAA that is 30 km wide. The RAA for all Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat was selected to
- 3 encompass the home ranges or dispersal distances of the most wide-ranging species in the
- 4 assessment (black bear, white tailed deer, elk, and red-sided garter snake).

- 5 Construction areas, burrow pits, equipment areas, etc all are, for the most part, within the 15
- 6 km buffer zone. There are exceptions. For example, a contractor may use an existing facility
- 7 with a mechanical bays to maintain or store equipment.

- 8 Beaver, muskrat, rabbit, red fox, grey fox, American badger, and other mammal species
- 9 (American marten) important to trappers and Aboriginal people were included within Chapter
- 10 9; however, focus were given to the species described in Table 9-1. It’s important to note that

11 hundreds of species occur in the Project region and it is not practical to address each species
12 individually. Rather, the discussion on wildlife and wildlife habitat focused on ‘focal species’ and
13 ‘species assemblages’ associated with three broad wildlife groups: mammals, birds and
14 herptiles. Rationale for the selection of the focal species is provided in Table 9-1 of the Chapter.
15 This rationale includes species considered important to those engaged in the First Nation and
16 Metis Engagement Process (FNMEP). The table includes notations that indicate which
17 community or communities provided comment on their value.

18 Yes, Manitoba Hydro considered species listed by the CDC as relevant for assessment of the
19 MMTP. Please see Table 9-1 for focal species that were selected because they were considered
20 a species of conservation concern and Table 9-5 for Wildlife species of conservation concern
21 with potential to occur in the RAA.

SUBJECT AREA: **Methodology, TEK**

REFERENCE: **PFN-IR-025**

QUESTION:

Regarding methodology for interviews, was there discussion with the First Nations and MMF of the Tri-Council's standards for interviews or appropriate methodology? Was disclosure or identification of methodology requested of First Nations, or provided in the ATK's or FNMEP?

RESPONSE:

- 1 The specific Tri-Council standards for interviews were not discussed with communities
- 2 undertaking studies.

- 3 The work done by each First Nation and the MMF is described by each in their respective
- 4 reports. Manitoba Hydro did not require the communities to follow specific methodology;
- 5 however, Manitoba Hydro did require that participants be fully informed of how any
- 6 information they might share may be used to inform the Project.

SUBJECT AREA: First Nation Consultation

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-001

QUESTION:

Section 4.3.1 of Chapter 4 of the MMTP Environmental Impact statement identified 'Aboriginal Chamber of Commerce' as an Aboriginal organization with interests/mandate in the Project Area. What interest or mandate was identified for the Aboriginal Chamber of Commerce. What about other organizations – Trappers Associations, Traditional Groups, Pow-wows, etc?

RESPONSE:

- 1 The Aboriginal Chamber of Commerce was identified based on their engagement in the Bipole
- 2 III Transmission Project. The Manitoba Trappers Association was included as a stakeholder
- 3 group in the Public Engagement Process.

- 4 Other stakeholder groups are outlined in Chapter 3 – Appendix 3A.

SUBJECT AREA: Traditional Land Use

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-004

QUESTION:

Line 1 and 2 – What are the available options to minimize or mitigate the effects on traditional plants within the ROW given that relocation is not feasible? What are the other options? Which are the preferred options?

Line 6 and 7 – Regarding identification of sites of traditional plants, both currently and ongoing, how is this recorded? Where? Is there a central repository for identified sites? When a site is identified, who is notified, and what is the process or protocol?

Line 8 and 9 – Is the designation of these sites done solely by Manitoba Hydro, or jointly with affected communities or interest holders? What if there is a dispute with respect to the designation of a site? Regarding factors considered, are there other significant factors apart from those listed? If so, what are they? How are the various factors weighted or assessed?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Available options to minimize or mitigate effects on traditional use plants within the ROW are
- 2 outlined in Chapter 22. Integrated vegetation management (IVM) and adjustment of final
- 3 structure location placement are preferred options. IVM may consist of mowing or grazing
- 4 areas to control vegetation growth or invasive non-native plant species, and spot application of
- 5 herbicides. Low growth vegetation, such as grasses, forbs and shrubs, will be maintained to the
- 6 extent possible.

- 7 Traditional use plant species were identified as part of a comprehensive species list at each
- 8 vegetation survey transect. Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates were recorded
- 9 for the start and end points of each transect using a global positioning system (GPS). All survey
- 10 data is stored in a Stantec corporate database and Manitoba Hydro corporate database. The

- 11 number of occurrences of traditional use plant species was reported in the EIS (section 10.4.7,
12 Table 10-13). No other reporting or notification was conducted.
- 13 Manitoba Hydro does not apply designations to sites with observed traditional use plant
14 species.

SUBJECT AREA: Country Food, Quality

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-006

QUESTION:

Lines 12-14: Manitoba Hydro will consider non-chemical vegetation management. What criteria will be used to determine whether vegetation management will be chemical or non-chemical? In the event of non-chemical vegetation management, what is the scope or boundaries? – ie, the specific area of the sensitive site? Or will it include drainage areas leading into the site? In the event of chemical vegetation management of sensitive sites, will there be provisions to notify potential users of the site of chemical management, the specific chemicals and potential effects of chemical management on health?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Please see response provided in PFN-IR-028.
- 2 If herbicides are utilized for vegetation management on MMTP, Manitoba Hydro advertises in
- 3 local community newspapers about its herbicide use programs on an annual basis each spring,
- 4 the advertisement provides information of the herbicides being used and contact info for
- 5 additional information on the application and any potential health effects.

SUBJECT AREA: Secondary Desktop Source

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-013

QUESTION:

Line 1 - 'A broad suite of literature available in the public domain...' Is any of this literature not specifically disclosed in section 11.11.1? Or to rephrase, does 11.11.1 comprehensively and separately list all public domain literature surveyed and relied upon by North/South? What were the criteria of North/South for selecting or assessing literature?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Manitoba Hydro's intent was to list all literature and sources referenced in Chapter 11. The
2 literature and sources used in support of the development of the report prepared by
3 North/South Consultants is provided within their report, and not repeated in 11.11.1.
- 4 Literature selection and assessment may be better described as a process instead of relying on
5 a set of pre-defined criteria. Three steps of the process are described below including defining
6 report objectives, preliminary research steps, and literature selection.
- 7 The objectives for the North/South Consultants Inc. report were to document existing available
8 knowledge on *"historical and contemporary Metis traditional use of resources within the*
9 *Manitoba-Minnesota Transmission Project Study Area"* (p.1).
- 10 To accomplish this objective, the following preliminary research steps were undertaken to
11 guide literature selection:
- 12 • Domestic/traditional resource use was defined (Section 1.2);
 - 13 • The presence of Metis as a distinct Aboriginal group in the region (e.g., circa 1800 and
14 later) defined the temporal scope of the report; and

15 • A review occurred for historic and contemporary land use practices and settlement
16 history in the Study Area as a primary focus, but literature searches also included
17 southern Manitoba and the prairies historically.

18 Literature selection involved the following searches and sources including but not limited to:

- 19 • Academic libraries (University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg/Brandon
20 University) for key words including “Metis”, “MMF”, “Aboriginal Land Use”,
21 “Aboriginal Rights”, “Aboriginal hunting rights” among others;
- 22 • Masters theses/practicums and Ph.D dissertations through the University of
23 Manitoba MSpace Library including searches within the Manitoba Heritage Theses
24 collection;
- 25 • Academic and historical journals such as the Manitoba Historical Society’s MHS
26 Transactions and the Virtual Museum of Metis History and Culture hosted by the
27 Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research;
- 28 • Metis scholars and historians’ publications including authors such as A.H. de
29 Tremaudan, G.J. Ens, T. Flanagan, J. Lagasse, Manitoba Metis Federation, Metis
30 Nation of Ontario, A.J. Ray, F. Tough and P. Usher among others;
- 31 • A search of government publications including relevant policy documents, legislation
32 and court cases (e.g., *R. vs. Goodon*); and
- 33 • EISs and supporting documents such as the Traditional Land Use and Knowledge
34 reports prepared for the BiPole III EIS.

35 Not all literature collected contributed to the report authored by North/South Consultants as
36 not all of it contained relevant information. This distinction is made by separate lists of
37 literature referenced and literature consulted in sections 8.0 and 9.0 respectively. Literature
38 that became available after March 2014 also would not have been included due to the report’s
39 publication date.

SUBJECT AREA: FNEMP Evidence

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-016

QUESTION:

Line 2 – ‘FNEMP includes as a subset, the development of ATK studies...’ How is FNEMP information outside of ATK studies distinguished from ATK studies? How are non-ATK sources identified in FNEMP? What are the limitations on application of ATK studies to First Nations or aboriginal groups which were not participants in the specific ATK?

RESPONSE:

- 1 Within the EIS, information from ATK studies is identified by formal reference to the specific
- 2 ATK study. Non-ATK sources of information are identified by making reference to the respective
- 3 First Nation, the round of engagement, or the FNMEP method or tool through which the
- 4 information was shared.

- 5 Information from a specific ATK study directly relates to the knowledge held by the community
- 6 who conducted the study; as such application of an ATK study is generally limited to the
- 7 community who conducted the study.

SUBJECT AREA: First Nation Engagement

REFERENCE: CEC-IR-079

QUESTION:

CEC-IR-079 Lines 2 through 6: 'Manitoba Hydro has been holding Environmental Protection Program meetings with communities.....' Is there a schedule or record of meetings held since the filing of the EIS? What communities and constituencies have been met with? What have the outcomes been, and how have concerns or issues been integrated into FNEMP or otherwise addressed?

CEC-IR-079 Lines 7 through 9: "To date, (Environmental Protection Program) meetings have been held with Peguis First Nation..." Since the filing of the EIS, what meetings have been held with Peguis or Peguis members on the Environmental Protection Program? When and where? Is there a record of the proceedings or outcomes of these meetings? What concerns have been raised? How have they been addressed?

CEC-IR-079 Lines 17-19: 'A follow up meeting is planned for March 23, 2017...' Did the meeting on March 23, 2017, occur? Was Peguis included? Is there a record? What were the outcomes? Was a Community Monitoring Working Group established? If so what is the scope, terms of reference and mandate of the Community Working Group? What is the membership? If no meeting was held on March 23, 2017, has it been rescheduled? If so, to when? Have the noted First Nations, including Peguis been notified of and formally invited to participate in a Community Working group? How does the Community Working Group fit with the Environmental Protection Program referenced above? Is it part of the Program? A separate initiative?

CEC-IR-079 Lines 28-29: "Hydro is working with Peguis First Nation to confirm..." Use of the word 'confirm' suggests that Manitoba Hydro has a template or model for how it proposes to use Peguis information to 'inform the project.' Please clarify Manitoba Hydro's intended uses. Are these uses include the Environmental Protection Program plans, or the Community Working Group?

RESPONSE:

1 Below is a schedule of EPP meetings held since the filing of the EIS.

Date	Community
March 04, 2016	Buffalo Point First Nation
February 17, 2016	Dakota Plains Wahpeton First Nation
May 26, 2016	Dakota Tipi First Nation
May 26, 2016	Peguis First Nation
April 11, 2016	Sagkeeng First Nation
October 25, 2016	Swan Lake First Nation

2 Key outcomes from the meetings include:

- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- confirming with each community what Manitoba Hydro has heard to date,
 - sharing Manitoba Hydro's proposed plan with community representatives,
 - discussing if concerns brought forward by the communities have been addressed, and
 - providing an opportunity for outstanding concerns to be raised.

7 During the meetings, no previously unidentified sensitive sites were identified. Progress has
8 been made on ATK reports since filing of the EIS. Sites identified as sensitive in those reports
9 will be reviewed and potentially added to the EPP.

10 Manitoba Hydro held an EPP meeting with Peguis First Nation representatives on May 26, 2016
11 at the Peguis offices, 1075 Portage Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba. Concerns heard at this meeting
12 included data sharing sensitivities and funding a future EPP meeting in Peguis First Nation, and
13 potentially other locations (Selkirk, Winnipeg). On this occasion, Manitoba Hydro provided two
14 letters in response to this meeting; one addressing concerns regarding EPP meetings and one
15 asking how to address concerns regarding data sensitivities. A response to these letters has not
16 yet been received.

17 Manitoba Hydro sent a follow-up letter to Peguis First Nation after the meeting offering a
18 broader community EPP meeting; however, to date no response has been received. Manitoba
19 Hydro does not have a template for how Peguis information will be used to inform the project.
20 Manitoba Hydro is working with Peguis First Nation to confirm how the information in their report will
21 be used to inform the EPP.

22 The March 23, 2017 monitoring meeting occurred and Peguis First Nation representatives were
23 in attendance. The Community Monitoring Workshop Group was not established as further
24 discussion is required.

SUBJECT AREA: Environmental Monitoring,

REFERENCE: PFN-IR-020

QUESTION:

"In British Columbia, it is common for BC Hydro to partner with First Nations to conduct environmental monitoring, as required, for projects. Is this type of collaborative monitoring being planned?

Will First Nations have input on which and how final valued components will be monitored and reported on? How will VCs be chosen to be a part of the adaptive management monitoring program?

Please explain this process, and how First Nations will be involved during the lifetime of the MMTP."

CEC-IR-079 does not answer the questions concerning valued components.

Please answer the questions concerning valued components, how they will be chosen.

RESPONSE:

- 1 Manitoba Hydro is interested in working with communities to develop a collaborative
- 2 monitoring program. Manitoba Hydro has initiated discussion on this topic. Manitoba Hydro is
- 3 open to discussions on the types of environmental components that will be monitored and how
- 4 First Nations and the MMF will be involved. While no decisions have been made at this time on
- 5 the content or nature of a potential collaborative program, Manitoba Hydro has established an
- 6 Environmental Monitoring Program to fulfill its regulatory commitments.