



Manto Sipi Cree Nation
P.O Box 97
God's River, MB
R0B 0N0

July 2, 2019

Director of Approvals and Environment Assessment
Manitoba Environment Act
Sustainable Development Manitoba
Winnipeg Manitoba.

Attn: Mr. Ouimet

Dear Director:

This letter is in response to review of the Manitoba Infrastructure (MI) EIS for P6 All Weather Road, as filed in the Manitoba Environment Act Public Registry – file # 5897

As you and your minister will know, Manto Sipi Cree Nation is affected and potentially would benefit from building of the all weather road, project # 6.

We are concerned about several aspects of this EIS and its review. Several affected Indigenous communities, including our own, are currently involved in review of the same EIS as part of the federal CEAA review of the project. The deadline for our work on that review is July 13, 2019. We feel strongly that these reviews should not overlap, and that Manitoba Sustainable Development will miss the opportunity to learn from our review of the EIS. Surely there is no hurry given that the intended start of construction would not be until 2030 as per the EIS contents. It is important to communicate this concern because the CEAA review is resourced, and allows us to seek assistance from experts. The Manitoba P6 EIS review is not resourced.

We are also concerned that sources of methods, or the bases for a range of self-assessment by MI for P6 are missing from this EIS. Professional Experience is used as a source often, but there are no professional experts identified. Also the basis for selection of VC is not clearly documented in the EIS. There is little attention to plants we rely on, gather and use as food and medicine. Generally the EIS is short on traditional knowledge. We feel the MI needs to source, and clearly stated its basis for assessment, methods, and especially boundaries as they are shown in the EIS product.

We should note that we were told that no paper copies of the EIS would be available to our consultants because nothing can be printed in the lead up to the provincial election. That date should have nothing to do with the ability to access information and products

to review this EIS. As it currently is assembled the EIS has huge PDFs of up to 130 mg. They are not accessible. There is also no folder of all the maps in one place in the EIS, as is standard in EIS for public works projects in Manitoba. Many of the maps are not accessible, not available free standing in the EIS. This makes our review more time consuming and difficult.

We are not able to understand how MI has determined our traditional territory, or why the trap lines our community members have used are not identified. It may be that MI does not know our full history. We will be providing that when we respond to the federal review. Again methods used for the conclusions in the EIS are not provided, and yet we know for instance, that the methodology for interviews and the forms used for those interviews, have been provided in other EIS products for roads filed by MI.

When we provide Information Requests to CEAA some of these questions will be evident. Another reason why it is inappropriate for this review to happen now given there is some much time before any construction is likely, as referenced in the MI EIS. Why rush the Manitoba EIS review before the CEAA process is completed, especially when the road construction would not start until 2030?

The MI EIS is not clear as to its content, and requirements with respect to the Manitoba Environment Act, and the scoping document for this project. Why does the EIS not acknowledge the Manitoba public policies, and regulatory framework required for this project? What is Manitoba using now that the guidelines and principles for sustainable development, which have been used since the 1990s, are no longer the policy framework for EIS projects which are also public works? How are we to know the public policy context for this Manitoba EIS review?

We expect to learn more as we work on our review for CEAA. It does appear though that for some reason MI determined that MSCN was less affected, or less relevant than our neighbours for this EIS. It is evident from the maps that our traditional territory, land use area, land selection processes, and potential affects on our rights are taken as being less than our neighbours. We consider this to be unfair, and see no reason for it. We remind you and MI that all our rights are the basis for determination of affect on our rights. This means no only treaty rights, which started long after our inherent, protected by the constitution Section 35 rights.

The appendices and attachments section of the EIS appear to be missing various documents. The MOUs with ESRA signed early in the P6 process, for instance, should be included. This is just one example.

Perhaps you should ask MI whether they ever sought MSCN sign off on the contents in the EIS about our nation and our ancestral lands. Did they ever provide us with the data we have asked for over the last two years? How did they arrive at these boundaries? Why were we not consulted about the contents of the EIS before it went to review?

At this time we do not consider the engagement with MI and their consultants to be satisfactory, and further we do not consider that consultation regarding P6 with the Manitoba Crown has started.

Yours sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Moses Okimaw
Advisor for P 6 Project
Manto Sipi Cree Nation

Copy to Chief and Council
Manto Sipi Cree Nation