

**LAKE MANITOBA LAKE ST. MARTIN OUTLET CHANNELS PROJECT
Draft Meeting Notes**

MEETING TOPIC: TAG Follow-up from August 30-31 Meeting

Meeting Date:	October 18, 2022	Teleconference:	Zoom Meeting (Virtual)
Meeting Time:	9:00 AM CST to 4:00 PM (CST)	Location:	Virtual – Zoom
Note taker	Mark Bowler - Impact Assessment Agency of Canada		
Facilitator	James Ransom – Tarbell Facilitation Network		

The following meeting notes were prepared by the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Round 2 IR Questions

James Ransom – Facilitating

Elder Mervin Sinclair of Lake St. Martin First Nation gave an opening prayer

The facilitator introduced himself and the host and the Impact Assessment Agency (the Agency) with Ian Martin, Greg Bosse, and Sean Carriere representing the Agency. The Technical Advisory Group was reminded that TAG meetings do not replace consultation. The facilitator provided a comprehensive land acknowledgment.

1. Logistics

The facilitator welcomed everyone to the continuation of the TAG meetings on August 30 and 31st for the Lake Manitoba Lake St. Martin outlet Channels Project to cover the remaining agenda items. The facilitator also went over general logistics and instructions for interacting with the Zoom application during the virtual meeting. Due to the virtual nature of the meeting, introductions were not held.

2. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Sean Carriere, Regional Director Prairie and Northern Region, Impact Assessment Agency of Canada:

Regional Director Sean Carriere welcomed everybody and expressed appreciation to the participants for taking the time to be here as a follow up on the in-person technical advisory group meetings on August 30 and 31st.

SC: This is a follow-up to cover-off some of the topic areas when we ran out of time and were not able to discuss them at the last TAG. The Agency has issued a formal information request, which outlines the information that Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure (MTI, the Proponent) is required to provide to continue with the environmental assessment. As part of the Technical Advisory Group, in those information requests, we are asking for any further clarification or granular detail on the questions to Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure. We are looking for how appropriate the responses to IR round 1 were and to cover crucial elements of the environmental assessment. We required more information about the Project. We are looking for any input related to potential solutions for the effects of the Project, and also looking for advice on what the potential effects are from your perspective. Again, I am thankful to be with you here today to better understand the potential effects of the proposed Project.

Project Name: Lake Manitoba Lake St. Martin Outlet Channels Project
CIAR Reference Number: 80148

The Agency will lead a presentation at the very beginning of the on-going discussions and I really hope that the time spent here today will help clarify details. We distributed the notes from the last meeting to all the participants of the Technical Advisory Group in August to validate the information that was discussed when we all came together. We have shared draft notes with Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure to inform their responses to the information that the Agency has requested.

The meeting notes from the last time as well as this follow-up meeting will be publicly posted to the Agency's Registry.

From the IR package issued on August 25, 2022, we proposed to discuss the topical areas of the Agency's Round 2 information request package. During the TAG meetings at the end of August, we talked through potential effects on surface water and groundwater as well as fish and fish habitat. Today we have the remaining topics which include the terrestrial environment, cumulative effects, and the other related items. The technical review process is ongoing as we don't have all the information that we need from Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure needed for the environmental assessment, so this meeting is part of that information gathering stage of the process.

3. TAG Overview and Last Meeting Summary

Presentation by the Agency:

The Agency led a review of the "Agenda", "Technical Advisory Group", "Summary of August TAG".

The Agency project manager led a presentation to cover remaining logistical items, a brief overview of the agenda, introduced the Agency staff and summarized the August meetings.

4. IR Response Comments and Round 2 IRs – Terrestrial Environment

Presentation by the Agency:

The Agency led a review of "Terrestrial – Summary of Comments", "Terrestrial – Information Requests", sections of the Agency presentation titled "Technical Review and Information Requests"

Question/Comment: Did you include concerns regarding the surface and underground water contaminations as that will influence terrestrial areas as well?

Response: Yes, we considered the water quality as it relates to all effects as well as water discharge from the springs into the environment.

Q/C: KGS study 2016 – Surface and groundwater quality study – information from the report seems to show that there may be a concern about sustainability of the aquifers. Did the Province or Federal Government request a comparison of water levels at the low end at 810 ft. vs 811.7 ft. above sea level (asl)?

R: With respect to the groundwater, we have been trying to ask about the wetland effects due to the water flow differences. We don't have an answer at this moment on the issue of the 810 ft. water levels on Lake Manitoba.

Q/C: It is on a regulated system. The lower limit is 810 ft. when the system was in a drought state the lowest level found was only 810 ft. asl. When there is so much water in the system it puts more pressure on the aquifers in the system. We are interested in the recharge/discharge.

R: Could you help me understand the specific effect of concern?

Q/C: What I have is information and evidence of the changes due to water system changes that have historically occurred in the area and the higher water is changing the underground system as well

Water levels there show changes to the Jackhead, Fisher River, and Peguis areas. Higher water in all areas takes longer to drain and changes the timing of the water flows and potentially frees up contaminants or supports the methylation of mercury.

R: The Agency put forward a question to MTI related to methyl mercury to help address this comment.

Q/C: From the date of last review of channels up in Playgreen Lake, the channels are not too different from what was done up there, there were effects on the ecosystem there that may be similar to the effects that could come from the project. There were even effects on permafrost up in the Norway House area, which widened the channels and destabilized the shoreline. This made transportation difficult.

Q/C: The Agency question mentions the complex interaction between groundwater, wetlands, and surface water but MTI is already studying the situation there and have confirmed that the aquifers are charging the wetlands. We still don't have clarification on the mitigation of effects to that. Since 2018, Fisher River Cree Nation has submitted some comprehensive consultation reports and comprehensive IR responses, traditional land use reports, and other reports. In almost 4 years Fisher River has not received responses on any of the concerns. Responses were promised by the end of the June – we still have no responses. If they provided answers to the concerns, we might not have to go through this meeting approach.

For FRCN, a certain number of wetlands comprises many acres that MTI does not include under their compensation. The *Water Rights Act* includes these wetlands, and it is puzzling as to what MTI may be trying to achieve by ignoring the requirements for wetland compensation.

R: With respect to the mitigation suggestions if you send them to the Agency, we can consider them as part of the process and include both the concerns and the mitigation suggestions.

With respect to wetland compensation, if wetland types do not qualify for compensation by the Proponent, the Proponent still needs to fully quantify the effects to wetlands that are not being compensated for so that the effects are understood and additional mitigations are proposed. We are following up with them.

In August, we heard a lot about the groundwater / surface water interactions. Those discussions are on-going, and we are still clarifying what is needed for those potential effects.

Q/C: Duty to consult includes responses to all the concerns of Fisher River Cree Nation. As noted already Fisher River Cree Nation has not received responses.

Morning break- to 10:20 CT

Q/C: I want to mirror those comments that MTI has been tardy at getting back to us on responses so far. They have not done the necessary sustainability studies on ground water and on surface water that they need to deal with.

I would like to talk on the dramatic impacts to the terrestrial environment due to the alteration of surface water drainage patterns. The channels intercept Birch Creek and Buffalo Creek and this will severely alter the drainage patterns. The priority besides the Lake Manitoba Outlet Channel is the landowners, the agricultural producers who grow crops. MTI's mitigation is to put a channel down on the upslope side of the Lake Manitoba Outlet Channel that will intercept water. The problem is this channel is designed for a 1:10 year summer rainfall event with unimpeded drainage. Once that rainfall event is exceeded the channel starts backing on the agricultural lands. I also know that MTI is designing the culverts, for instance Highway #6, for a 1:50 year drainage design capacity. So the roads have a higher priority than agricultural land. Maybe that's appropriate, but nonetheless these landowners on the upside slopes are going to be impacted on the outside of the channel. They will be impacted in terms of spring floods. It will

have an impact on agricultural crops, particularly in drought years through crop losses, and it could back up from snowmelt which will affect their seeding. It doesn't seem as though MTI is looking at this at all, so I don't know where they're going to get the water after they have changed the system.

Q/C: On behalf of Peguis, I agree with the previous comments. MTI has not provided responses in a timely manner. I don't think their mitigation will work. The wetland classification system MTI is using is basically the classification system of the National Wetlands Working Group system and the Stewart and Kantrud classification system. Their systems basically classify wetlands in terms of their hydrology classifications. Where are they getting the water from? Is it precipitation or getting the water from groundwater? Wetlands require certain water quality. You cannot take the water from Lake St. Martin and expect the wetlands to survive. The classification system uses some vegetation types and soil types and just puts them into what is a settler classification system. A system that has been made by science or for agricultural impacts to classify agricultural wetlands. In no way does this wetland classification system work in terms of how First Nations see them. So there is no evaluation in here that would equate to how First Nations value and use this system when they start looking at compensation. They start looking at these five classes of wetlands. These are what Manitoba Infrastructure were looking at in the EIS, the ones that they were going to classify as class 3 are, to me, probably the most valuable wetlands - fens and bogs. The classification system that is being used here is inappropriate when you're trying to measure the impacts of a project on the traditions and rights of First Nations.

R: MTI is using two systems for the baseline assessment, but only one of them for compensation. The Canadian Wetland Classification System was used for the LSMOC particularly because, as was mentioned, are primarily organic wetlands of fens and bogs. The Stewart and Kantrud system is really directed towards mineral wetlands which are typical along the LMOC. The compensation under the water rights legislation is focussed on those agricultural types so those not within that system are not being compensated for in the Proponents' plans. Other wetland types, including those of value to Indigenous users as described, which are not planned to be compensated for still require mitigation measures that will restore some function. The Agency is aware of this and has put forward a question around the compensation approach. The Agency recognized there needs to be some mitigation proposed for potential adverse effects resulting from those changes.

Q/C: How you are going to value these wetlands and in terms of First Nations traditions. This is a very important part of this project and the wetlands are going to be damaged by the Project. There's no doubt that the water regimes are going to be changed and wetlands are also very susceptible to changes such as very small changes in water levels as well as water quality. Downstream of these channels, those wetlands will indeed suffer. In the same way - what type of water quality? Is the actual estimate for damage to the wetlands based on basically a half a kilometre on each side of the channels? The 1/2 kilometre zone is based on the emergency outlet channel. Do you know what the vegetation looks like around there?

They (MTI) have now dug the channels deeper and wider (in the new plan), than the emergency channel and therefore the impact on the wetlands on each side is going to be much greater. This is an important point since the EOC was 3m or 4m, while these channels are 4m deeper. Therefore, the effects of the groundwater on the wetlands will probably extend out there by a kilometre - or probably it will be kilometres. The change to the groundwater supply should be looked at. What is the water quality? By water quality, what I mean is the mix between surface water coming from precipitation and groundwater. How will this be different? Receiving water from groundwater when you're cutting background water off, you're going to be drying. Then if you try to mitigate the water with more surface water. You're not going to get that complex again - it won't survive - it may change but to me that's a big problem. The estimate based on the EIS, vastly underestimates the amount of damage that is going to occur by constructing the channels to the wetlands. I keep coming back to mitigation. Replacing water that has been intercepted by these proposed channels, by replacing that water that is basically coming from Lake St. Martin. That is not going to work.

Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure tells us that there is no science to tell them what's going to happen but that's wrong. The science is very mature in this area and if you want, look at some of the oil sands science on this. On water replacement, there's a lot of science on hydrology and the water quality that is required to replace and there's also a lot of predictive science out there in terms of wetlands and how to ensure survival from projects. So, there's been a lot of investigation and I would like to see MTI start looking at the predictive science out there and come to grips with what they think the damage will be.

R: I think I captured the concerns: the footprint changes, the changes in water, and around tools that may be available for MTI to use to mitigate. So basically, assess the degree of change in the classes that are present. With respect to some of the augmentation what's planned as mitigation would be to monitor and to adjust that augmentation strategy. What I'm hearing is that predictive tools should be used beforehand.

Q/C: Under the new Act (IAA), Manitoba would be forced to go and pick up the science to show right now the results of those predictive tools. But because we're under the auspice of the old Act (CEAA 2012) that basically allows you to get away without using science are the stocks. I would like to see the Agency use all the science available to them to predict accurately what the damage is going to be today and then to come up with mitigations and/or compensation.

R: Thank you, I'll note that comment. At this time we need to understand what the potential effects of the Project are and how they will be mitigated.

The facilitator described some of the chat comments

Q/C: If MTI is allowed to depressurize the ground water, it's going to displace 10,000 ha of wetland. If that's not the biggest concern to terrestrial life, I don't know what is. The 23km right of way for the LMOC is currently a water discharge zone. If MTI is allowed to depressurize the aquifer, will the area turn into a water recharge zone? Will surface water be allowed to enter the aquifer?

R: I'm not an expert in that area, so that's something I'd like to take away. However, I believe that Steve had brought that up in the previous sessions in August that there are provisions of provincial law about ground water under influence. So, I think there are some more things to consider with federal authorities. I don't have a really good answer right now, unfortunately.

Q/C: What about the integration of Indigenous knowledge in the assessment and the baseline information?

R: EIS Guidelines require that.

Q/C: Just for the record, the question I wanted to note or the issue I want to raise is tied to this issue of MTI providing the bare minimum. So I just want to flag the situation, which we have expressed through the process as well this morning that MTI seems to take the position that they're required to provide Canada with a response but there is no requirement for it to be what I would consider a useful response. Or for that matter for it to be a response that is actually appropriate given the concerns that are being raised. There seems to be a pattern of MTI providing just a bare minimum in responses that have long been out of date. It seems as though their consulting firms and their experts have not kept up with either the science or the perspectives of Indigenous Nations. What I'm finding is that the questions, concerns, comments, and issues being raised by Nations are being dismissed by Manitoba and that their responses continue to be inadequate at best. You read them and they're just not useful at all. It would seem to me that the consultants that the Nations have chosen to use are so far advanced that MTI can't keep up. Something I want to identify as an issue is the traditional knowledge and concerns that have been raised earlier today. These have been raised through a number of submissions, which MTI have seemingly dismissed. The idea that you can mitigate impacts on rights and interests of Indigenous Nations by changing or not changing the water levels or even doing the bare minimum. It is rather concerning there doesn't seem to be any intention on the part of MTI to actually

address the concerns. MTI needs to answer them, and by that I mean they need to provide an answer to the IR. Answer the question and not just tick a box by providing an answer. So, I do want to just flag that to-date MMF is still waiting on MTI to provide meaningful responses to the questions that we've asked. I am reminded of that in all the conversations I've had with others on the call and information provided to date.

I don't know any Nation that has received the information that they've asked for and it's a little bit challenging to understand why we are all spending so much time helping Canada go through all these items when we've already asked MTI for the answers to these questions. We are now essentially going over Canada's perspective of what we've asked Manitoba for, which I appreciate. But what I really would appreciate, would be for Canada to go back to MTI and get them to answer the questions. The Nations continue to spend time spinning our wheels, doing this to provide Canada with better information, so that Canada knows what to ask MTI, when we've already asked these questions and have received the bare minimum response as it relates to all the topics we are discussing today. I have several specific concerns but my primary concern is that regardless of which topic we're discussing, MTI has not provided a response. Thank you.

Q/C: First of all, when we did an opening prayer, I mentioned that as long as the sun shines, the grass grows, and the rivers flow I understand all these elements will continue but man has interfered with the creation from the Creator. Based on water flow, we wouldn't be having any issues if it wasn't for man building a diversion in the first place and not to protect your investment, of both governments and City of Winnipeg. NRTA was passed in 1930, for the Provinces of BC, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba to take control over the provinces' natural resources. When this was transferred, First Nations people weren't included in the consultation. So I believe that if Canada still wants to control what is happening in our traditional area let's acknowledge where you are. We are in Treaty 2. I believe that we are, and have been, heavily impacted by the control of the Fairford on Lake Manitoba that comes into Lake St. Martin. Man has destroyed our way of life.

What will be there for the next generations on Lake St. Martin, now that it's been proposed to put an outlet channel to Lake Winnipeg? These are traditional areas where we do a lot of our harvesting, trapping, and hunting. This situation is destroying our future for our next two generations. Back in 2011, we and our children were displaced. We've been relocated now to what they call higher grounds but there is an impact within our area with the water – do you know that groundwater saturation of the lands continues to impact everyone? I just want to ask Canada to stop the project from going ahead. Manitoba has not worked with us ever since the NRTA was signed for the natural resources. Our Nations continue to be here you know. I believe that we should know how this is going to go on.

Manitoba is continuing to go ahead with this project. I see the trucks coming to our community every day, stockpiling the gravel. That's going to start in the next while. So no, we haven't been properly consulted.

It was to help with flooding. They're going to continue doing the work on the channels, but some of it should go towards the City of Winnipeg at the source of the diversion. If it did, we would have no problem. We were told a while back when we had these flood problems that the earth or God created it. No, it's man thinking that they can control the water. When you look at the damage to the area, we have 4 court cases that are with the Queen's Bench. I'm not for this project continuing and Canada is not doing anything. Just my thoughts, my comments.

R: I would just like to say thanks for that perspective on the ongoing challenges being faced and thank you for sharing.

Q/C: My understanding is that wetland compensation can be created anywhere in the province and there is nothing stipulating that the compensation is done in the area. Our RM (Rural Municipality) has insisted that wetland compensation projects be done in the impacted area and that local communities be involved with MTI.

Q/C: This fall, FRCN insisted that wetland compensation projects be in the impacted area and that local communities be involved. MTI had agreed to this verbally, I need to check if there is any confirmation by email.

R: With respect to wetland compensation for this project, compensation doesn't mean (for example) in the Southwest portion of the province. As part of the Round 2 information requests, we have sought additional information on the timing and locations for compensation that would occur so that there is documentation of our understanding. Compensation in another part of the province doesn't mitigate for the effects of the Project. That is, in order to be considered a potential mitigation, it needs to be in the project area.

Facilitator: There is a comment (in the chat) from Ian Halket saying how neither the (Water Rights) Act or regulation reference the Stewart and Kantrud system or any classification system.

Q/C: My opinion is that you can't pass a regulation that is contrary to the intent of the Act and if you go by that then really MTI isn't obligated to do any wetland compensation because you're exempt. I think they understand that there is credit for agreeing to compensate for water, again that's not enough. The wetlands are too important to the entire area, to the groundwater, to the surface water, to the wildlife and everything else. To destroy some and not replace it. Oh, and fish habitat, I should mention, we forget it is very important, that times (seasons) are important to them (fish). I just wanted to make sure that you know that it's an agricultural classification system for Southern Manitoba.

R: There needs to be clarity on the *Water Rights Act* and Regulation in Manitoba by MTI. I'm not an expert on the provincial requirements. I will say that there are potential opportunities once we get some additional clarity around this and an official decision could include conditions around some of these aspects. So, we're not there yet and those are things that would need to be considered by the Minister in a decision.

Q/C: We are quite concerned about the potential downstream impacts of the Project but also the impacts in the areas that would be immediately affected by the channels. I just wanted to pick up on a couple of the aspects of the impacts to wetlands that have been raised already. One of the arguments that MTI makes is that if they can prevent major flooding in the extreme events around Lake St. Martin and Lake Manitoba, that it will be a benefit to the terrestrial and wetland habitats since it wouldn't be subjected to extreme events like that. It seems their argument balances off a little bit of the direct impacts to wetlands that would be experienced by immediate redirection of fast surface waters and potentially groundwater. At the end of the day, when you look at the EA process, we're left with looking at what the residual effects would be and how significant those are. Clearly in this exercise the significance of wetland loss to Indigenous peoples is not anywhere near appreciated. Neither is the understanding of the complexity of the wetlands. It's not that easy to just compensate for wetland loss. Wetland systems are extremely complex - they evolve over time - and can't just be created by injecting new water. A wetland that can maybe be created in a dry area is not ever going to have the same biodiversity as a natural wetland that developed in response to natural seasonal changes in water flow, precipitation, groundwater, and surface water.

One of the things I would like to see in these exercises is far more transparency and honesty about the potential results of wetland compensation. We know that there will be long-term degradation in the wetlands and it will add, in an enormous way, to degradation that has happened all over the province already from various other water control projects. I would like to see MTI be asked to explain, in far more detail, what the limitations are to wetland compensation, what has been tried in other parts of the province, what are the results of that and what is the uncertainty. So at the end of the day, if people are being asked to approve or support a project like this, what are we dealing with in terms of uncertainty? In my view there's a lot of uncertainty here that we probably cannot answer. We should be doing more studies, but we're not going to be able to answer all these questions because it would require long-term monitoring and also because of the complexity of these systems. We can't just say we're going to do monitoring and it's all going to be OK. There is uncertainty, as well as heightened vulnerability because of climate change. This past year we've had record high water levels coming from the Winnipeg River system and the Red River system. Water levels are still elevated downstream because of the requirement for water to pass through the Portage diversion and Winnipeg. Right around the proposed channels as well as the downstream riparian and wetland areas that are affected by the Lake Winnipeg Regulation is huge. As a society, people must be honest about

the fact that this us manipulating the environment in a very large way and that we as humans cannot completely control it.

R: I think the Agency is trying to get some additional clarity around compensation and related uncertainty. Clarity on compensation is something that the Agency put forward to MTI as part of the Round 2 IRs but one thing I'm hearing and - I just clarify that I heard it accurately - is that compensated wetlands don't hold the same value and that compensation isn't necessarily a one-to-one replacement.

Q/C: In most cases that I have examined over time that is the case, unless it can be demonstrated first that there is a good baseline information to really understand the biodiversity that exists in a natural wetland. We obviously don't have that here and it's very difficult to gather that kind of information. Long-term observations and knowledge of people - traditional knowledge - is obviously the richest source of knowledge about the environment. However, it's not necessarily complete either because it's held by so many different people and that knowledge changes over time. It is very complex to have a full baseline and when you don't have a comprehensive baseline it's very difficult to - impossible really - to do monitoring and understand what exactly the effects of this project are. To re-create a wetland is extremely difficult because the geological characteristics of the area and the chemical composition of water have a big effect on what type of wetland can develop in an area. Plant seeds from species of plants that are in a region that can re-populate a wetland will differ as well. It's very complex and I haven't seen very many examples of wetland compensation that have been able to demonstrate that you have re-created a wetland that has equal biodiversity to what was there before.

Another reason why we have faster runoff during extreme events is because of the drainage of wetlands through the watershed. The beginnings of some legislation has been created to try to slow the process of removing wetlands down. But it's increasing drainage of agricultural and urban land so it's a very challenging position that we're in as a society right now to try to mitigate the effects of projects that already exist. I think we must be honest with ourselves. We can't just go and wipe out some wetlands here and put some nice new ones in another place and come out at the other end with an equally biodiverse environment. I don't think that's going to happen and if anybody could convince me of that I might feel a little bit better. They (MTI) could be asked to provide examples of where wetland compensation has been successful in re-creating equal biodiversity. It doesn't mean we shouldn't try it where it's impossible to avoid wetland destruction or degradation, but we must be clear-headed about what we're capable of doing.

Q/C: The comments this morning about traditional knowledge are so valid. Wetland compensation is from the colonial perspective and not in the traditional perspective. Our people have been on the land for hundreds of years and that can't be learned that in any institution. How do you compensate for the loss of medicine? There is a man-made marsh using water of the Red River but the river water isn't a natural way to feed it. The elders suggested adding wild rice because it brings back the waterfowl and the waterfowl will add fertilizer to the bottom. It's a natural balance.

Why did Lake Manitoba flood in the first place? It wasn't a natural act of God - its drainage. A lot of the devastation around the world today is man-made. They want to make money through drainage and moving water. For the last 10 years, conservation district managers would welcome moving water within our region to help the farmers. The devastation on the lake killed one of the best whitefish fisheries in the north. What's going to happen here is wrong. Lake St. Martin is full of biodiversity and freshwater shrimp. What happens at the first big flush and all that stuff is gone? How is it going to impact? What's going to happen with all those medicines? It needs to be grown in a natural state. Pollutants will come down from Saskatchewan river.

The impacts to medicines will be huge. How do you compensate for the medicines that we lose? And our people are using medicines today to help us heal from Covid and other things. The scope of work has changed dramatically from the EIS and I need to say we are looking at challenging this whole process within the legal system because it is not a

fair process. We have talked about how long it has taken for MTI to respond. It has been 36 months of consultation and there are still IRs that haven't been addressed and we seem to be left in the dark. We try and get our monitors into the field and we always seem to run into problems such as what dates, times, and last minute notifications of places to stay out of. They make it difficult for us to participate in this process.

Getting back to the scope of work, at the very beginning of the Project we were looking at animal movement as well as zebra mussels. Animals will not cross the channel because it will be too rough and damaging. We need to look at a new Section 35 process with all the information that's here today. People need to know the truth and MTI has to be honest and transparent about the work that's been happening. It's cart before the horse with MTI already going to start crushing gravel for the roads needed for the work. There's so much going on here that people aren't even aware. Heritage resources are not being looked at. We've heard Fisher River and other communities that the responses were very poor and it's very frustrating. In August we had an 11,000 page document and had thirty days to review it with one man plus one of my staff members. Is that possible when all of a sudden MTI submits and I am working on their timeline in a Section 35 process? There's no fairness and that's what the Supreme Court talks about – fairness and opportunity. MTI asked to keep the Project under the old Act. It seems like the Agency and MTI are on the same wavelength and I believe that's why the First Nations think the Agency will support the Project in the end because that is what you are showing us through your actions. Show us otherwise and act on our behalf. Be transparent and let us know in a timely fashion.

R: Thank you, and I appreciate that feedback, on the Project and process to date. It's definitely not falling on deaf ears. There's a lot that we're taking away from these comments.

Facilitator: I have a couple of comments in the chat. Jared Whelan says: Should the IAAC recommendations to the Federal Minister not include the minimum provincial regulations as well? Can IAAC ask the Proponent to re-issue the EIS with all the changes, answers to information requests and supporting plans?

R: With respect to decisions, I don't think that we are in a position to reiterate in our approvals what is already required in provincial regulation. I don't think that's something that we would do. What we can include in conditions are things that are separate issues from those that are already being regulated at the provincial level. With respect to re-issuing the EIS, the Agency will take that away for consideration.

Q/C: IAAC accepted the project description but it was difficult to assess because of limited information. I think the fast tracking of this Project that was done in 2019 was to get it in under CEAA 2012, and that eliminated new IAA components and requirements for MTI. You heard from the experts in the community that the EIS shouldn't have been considered acceptable.

On different projects I have found out that there is an agreement with the Saskatchewan government and Manitoba related to flood management. The agreement does not seem to consider wetlands. There are wetlands in existence that are not natural. For example, just North of Lake St. Martin there's a highway that runs east and west where there's a number of livestock producers in that area. It became so saturated that they had to put down some of the livestock because of getting stuck in the mud. A lot of these wetlands were backfilled so that farmers could expand their operations. In Watchorn Bay, before the Fairford Water Control Structure, there used to be a natural connection. When you start backfilling natural flows, it will have effects. When you get a high water event that's where you're seeing flooding and then they wonder why they're not getting more natural water flow.

The system is affected by diversions and it caused a lot of the issues. It's the management of the water levels on the lake itself and the fact that the Jenpeg structure doesn't have the capacity to move the required water or to adapt. It is an integrated system of water on Lake Winnipeg, Lake of the Woods, and on the Cedar Lake Reservoir. The province thinks that they can manage these resources. In 2017 what was built up was the resource water supply in the system which also caused a buildup in the Cedar Lake reservoir. By building a system in isolation you are not

using all the accurate information or all the information that should be included for a project. It takes away from the integrity of the information.

The management of the diversion and holding of water in other areas are probably what caused the 2011 flood. Many kilometres of land that has been impacted by high water events since the buildup on the highway. This is more important than protecting the lake areas because the water moving from west to east is otherwise going to flood the highways. One hundred and sixty-six culverts have been upgraded because they are looking for solutions to move water from west to east.

Manitoba Hydro builds up the water and there are terrestrial impacts. When there's pressure in the system it forces the surface water underground. Surface and groundwater also affects the fens. As they become more saturated what happens is the deterioration of the plants and vegetation and it is creating methane and carbon dioxide. How do you compensate for water levels for example on the Poplar River? There was some consultation done by the Province and the federal government for Bi-Pole III. There is a couple that always - for about five decades - used to go and gather plants and medicines upstream. Because of the regulation it saturated the forests where they picked their medicines. They described walking into an area that they used to harvest in and it had really intense odor of rotting organics. In consultation they didn't get a response on what it was they detected. The overland flooding contributes to this in many places around the lake in northern Manitoba.

In 2017, under the northern flood agreement, the Province and Manitoba Hydro put all this water in and then released it at six times the daily average and they drained the lake from May to September. Consultation before that was not done. Two years of access was lost in that area, affecting the terrestrial area. It is difficult to listen to knowing that the Proponent isn't providing you with the required information to assist with assessing a Project like this. When we talk about the terrestrial area with you, the area affected is partly controlled by the requirements of the Lake Manitoba artificial regulation. Lake Manitoba has a 1.2 TW energy value which they require in order to supply electricity to the US. I would like to share that with you.

R: Thank you. I think we will have to take that in as information for now.

Q/C: I would like to see follow-up about the changes to the Project. There have been huge changes to the Project and it is not the same as it was in the EIS. It's very difficult now to look up particular issues within this Project because the project description has changed. There's the north and south basin with the narrows as a hydraulic control. You have to go through the IRs and also the responses to the IRs to figure out what the new water levels are and, for example, how they treat groundwater. They have done a lot more work on the groundwater - especially on the northern channel (LSMOC). For armouring, it's very difficult to find out what size they will be using, how long, and is it going to be lined with gravel or is it going to be a blasted rock gravel with sharp edges? This matters for many animals. MTI should update the project description and give us a new project description with all the changes as it would make it easier and better for those who are trying to take the new project on and assess its impacts. For example, the gates now include flow channels for providing minimum levels of flow through the channels. How is pressure going to be released from the aquifer? How are they going to do that and is that design done yet? How much are they going to lower the water level? The fisheries biologists need that information to be able to do their assessments to the impacts on the fishery. But to get that information right now it means going through four or five different documents and engineering reports and then responses to our questions. It's difficult and we need a better description of this project.

R: I would like to note that many of those changes occurred as a result of issues raised in this process and that is part of the purpose of the EA process. But with respect to getting a new updated project description. I'll take that away. We will have to have a discussion and get back to you on that.

R: We're hearing concerns about the Project being a foregone conclusion. There is no foregone conclusion and we are still assessing the Project and its potential effects. We are meeting with communities and it's just that we're not there yet. I have also heard that the consultation team is a bit too "lockstep" with the Proponent on the meetings. I apologize if it appears that way and it is not accurate. Should anybody want to do a tripartite meeting with the Proponent or a federal only meeting, I am in Manitoba almost weekly now and can be available in person. The Agency has been reaching out weekly to communities but there has not been much uptake on meetings to discuss potential impacts of Project. We will continue to reach out. We want to hear from the communities, elders, and teams on potential impacts. We are trying to respect communities' time, but the meetings don't have to be tripartite. Anytime you want to meet up, whatever works for you, we'll make it happen. Let us know how you would like to do the consultation.

Q/C: I realize it's difficult but the general summary of the project should be updated for the benefit of the public. Everybody in the province who are following – and even other parts of the country - so that it's clear that the reason for the Project is not just to mitigate flooding on Lake St. Martin or Lake Manitoba but it's considered to be necessary because of the impacts of existing infrastructure. And this is really important from the point of view of everybody who's directly impacted because it does have an influence on how other parts of the system end up being managed. I am in particular referring to the Lake Winnipeg Regulation and the Portage Diversion. All of us need to really understand that the reason we're where we're at now is not just because of acts of nature. It's a very difficult situation for the Province to be in as well, they have to do something (to deal with flooding). What they're going to do is not an easy choice. I think that's one role that the federal impact assessment process can play is to force the hand of the Proponent to be transparent about the justification for this project.

Lunch Break

The meeting recessed at 12:10 p.m. and resumed at 12:45 p.m.

5. IR Response Comments and Round 2 IRs – Cumulative Effects

Presentation by the Agency:

The Agency led a review of "Cumulative Effects and other items- Summary of comments", "Cumulative Effects and other items – Information Requests"

Q/C: *From Chat* Has MTI filed all the reports from their Government website with IAAC or have they been filed as answers to the information request? <https://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/wms/lmblsmoutlets/resources/reports.html>

R: I will look through this, though I believe most of these items have been submitted in one way or another.

Q/C: My colleagues that represent the Nelson River Communities and others would really like to speak to the issue of downstream effects. We're looking forward to some in person meetings as well because we haven't had those and would very much appreciate them going forward.

We appreciate the details of IR 22. We would like additional information and analysis on what the potential impact is of pushing flood waters into Lake Winnipeg more quickly. A small increase in peak flood levels could still be important to downstream communities. It has a cascading effect. MTI had done some basic analysis in the past. Most people on this call probably understand the basics of the system and are aware that the Lake Winnipeg Regulation requires Manitoba Hydro to basically open the spillway and release water from Lake Winnipeg as quickly as possible when levels go above the regulated level, which they did this year. MTI has downplayed the potential impacts downstream because they say that the Dauphin River - Lake St. Martin system - contributes a small percentage of the inflow to Lake Winnipeg relative to the Red River, Winnipeg River, or Saskatchewan River. While this is absolutely true, does it mean that a small increase in peak flood levels downstream would not be significant to the downstream

indigenous communities? So we really want to dig into this in more detail because it's important. MTI suggests that because the water levels downstream are already so erratic that the increase from the Project will not be important. It's true the water levels downstream are incredibly erratic because of the control from Jenpeg and the upstream control system. To get metaphorical, you talk about the straw that broke the camel's back. It is as if they consider that the camel's back is already broken in this case and so it doesn't really matter how much more you pile on top. But it does matter to the people downstream. So we want to have a detailed analysis of the potential effects here and not just a ballpark. The water level peak could be a few centimeters higher. This year in fact the water levels have been at historic highs in the downstream area because of inflow from rivers like the Winnipeg River and Red River. What would happen if we had major precipitation like that in the whole system in the East and the West? Question 22 is really good in asking for additional information about water levels and the duration of increased water levels.

We would also like to dig more into the specific effects of velocities on 2 mile and 8 mile along with other narrows downstream. First of all, we need to be provided a complete comprehensive description of what is currently understood about erosion rates within these narrows. What is the current state of those channels and what kind of mitigation has been needed since they were constructed to try to control erosion? Explain the uncertainty around this analysis. We know that there's a great deal of uncertainty and this should be made transparent. If we do have the next major flood, and we add the contribution of the proposed channels to the effects, we can do some ballpark estimates of the downstream water levels. How long will they last? Will they last longer? What could the velocities potentially be? We won't be able to calculate that in quantitative terms - it's too complex. We have to be clear about that so that when people are dealing with the relicensing of the Lake Winnipeg Regulation they are not complacent about the fact that we could be increasing the downstream impacts where people are already suffering.

Very long term and serious impacts could result from the fact that water can be released from Lake Winnipeg up to 50% more quickly than under the natural conditions. It is because of the Lake Winnipeg Regulation that effects are pushed downstream into Nelson River. We would like a discussion about the effects of periods of high water levels caused by upstream water control on the shoreline habitats and riparian habitat. There's a lot of devastation to medicinal plants that are growing in that type of environment and they have already been severely degraded. Even characterizing the current state of riparian habitats. As far as we understand this hasn't begun yet. LWR will be relicensed in another two years and I have suggested that a comprehensive environmental assessment be done around the LWR. There's no reason why this project shouldn't be looked at in this context since it would add to the existing control structure. And obviously MTI should look at corresponding effects to land-use by the people downstream. Parts of the north basin by Limestone Bay as well as Cross Lake are very important. Those are a few additions to that IR that I think would be reasonable. For that I thank you.

R: I appreciate your comments on this to the Agency. I think these are very good comments that we should be able to move forward and that need to be understood. I think this is an opportunity for us to have a conversation to make sure that we each fully understand the effects. Absolutely we need to meet with all the community representatives.

Q/C: Just briefly to add another aspect of this, the challenge that the communities such as Norway House Cree Nation are dealing with are downstream effects to community infrastructure. Given the historic high water levels downstream, this year there are a lot of challenges with operating and maintaining the water treatment system in the community. It needs to be more robust because of the amount of debris in the water. Water quality in general has been affected by upstream erosion. It's a big topic as well because of incremental cumulative effects on the downstream conditions in these communities.

Q/C: I have a common question, about the facts and I'm not sure if we are on the same page as MTI on this one. What is MTI required to do for an assessment? When we look at cumulative effects, we think it should be specific to each community, rather than an average of effects. Each community will have different Aboriginal rights and

different priorities, so the effects should be community specific. Fisher River Cree Nation people are impacted directly and indirectly by the proposed project. They have timber harvesting rights in the area, commercial fishing rights in the area, the McBeth fishing Station, and they have resource tourism licensing for the entire area. I asked for a definition of the boundaries of cumulative effects including the recent past and reasonably foreseeable future. Fisher River Cree Nation has been affected by night hunting regulation, peat harvesting operations, disturbances to traditional hunting and gathering areas. I guess my question is, should MTI be doing impact assessments on each community rather than lumping them together, as they are not the same. Indigenous nations and Metis nations should not be all lumped together.

R: All items raised will be taken away and we'll ensure that we follow up with MTI.

With respect to cumulative effects on a group by group basis, if there is a unique adverse effect, then that cumulative effect has to be considered. Multiple effects can contribute to overall significance of the cumulative effects. Understanding effects needs to come from consultation and I know that many groups have raised concerns to MTI that may feed into that assessment.

Q/C: I want to reiterate some of the things that Annette and Harley just mentioned. We had a chance to meet with MTI in Grand Rapids a few weeks ago. It was the first in-person meeting with MTI on the project. One of the questions around assessments made me wonder what role I had in consultation. MTI seemed to be of the opinion that there was no point in bringing up effects on Misipawistik since Misipawistik is so far away from the project area. They consider Misipawistik as less impacted than other First Nations. Our response to that statement is, and always has been, that the determination of lesser impacted or more severely impacted can only come from communities through consultation. Communities need to rely on consultation to understand potential effects and determine the extent of impacts. This has come up again and it makes us question whether or not they are consulting in good faith and respecting the honour of the Crown. We were excited to have the Proponent in the community presenting information but they started the meeting off on the wrong foot with a PR video presentation that had promotional information and wasn't based on adequate information.

The EIS guidelines clearly states that the assessment process is about working together to mitigate effects and working toward a decision on approval. The way that MTI presented information made it seem as though that (approval) was a foregone conclusion. They were clear that they were managing engagement with us to see how they can make sure that the project is completed. That is not the purpose of the process and it brings into question whether MTI is the appropriate entity to consult on their own behalf. It seems to be a big question to me, especially if the courts get involved in this project.

R: In order to fulfill duty to consult, we can only speak to our role (IAAC). We will definitely note this about consultation activities. You are more than welcome to provide a summary that is in the community's words that can be moved up to the Minister for consideration. All communities are welcome to do this. Is there anything specific I can clear up?

Q/C: What role does IAAC have in holding MTI accountable? And MTI's consultation role and the conflict of interest - just wanted to put it on the record for all the TAG members to note.

R: MTI has developed its own consultation branch and is determining the way to go forward.

The decision of whether or not the Project is approved under CEAA 2012 is with the federal Minister. As you may remember, MTI does establish its own approach to consultation on projects, and I think they heard you. We'll have to see the response from MTI. As far as keeping MTI accountable – there are a number of decision-making facets including an environmental monitoring committee.

R: At the end of the process, the Agency is not the decision-maker – it is the Minister (of Environment and Climate Change). Our advice will be about whether or not there are significant residual adverse effects on the valued components of the environment, including Indigenous people and their rights. Getting the submissions correct is helpful when it comes to summarizing the right information. This ensures that the effects are known and mitigated to the extent possible.

Q/C: I would like to add to some of the comments on the cumulative effects. It's important to consider the Lake Winnipeg Regulation report from 1979. The Churchill River diversion and Lake Winnipeg regulations were both necessary to do the downstream Nelson River projects.

In terms of the impacts and the downstream effects, the reason for the Churchill diversion was to assist with the supply of water from the lake because the amount of water moving from Lake Winnipeg for electricity generation projects was reduced simply because of ice freezing on the lakes. The reduced availability of water in Lake Winnipeg requires water from the Churchill River Diversion to make up the balance. Lakes like Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg factor into the system that Hydro depend on to maintain their electricity generation. For example, back in 2011 they opened structures in Saskatchewan through an agreement to move water from their emergency channel into the Assiniboine. Then Manitoba Hydro can maximize the flows when it was starting to freeze. They had the same amount of water, so they had to reduce the flow because it was upsetting some of the infrastructure down the Nelson River.

They have a license for the Lake Winnipeg Regulation. It's from 710 to 715 ft. asl and when you're operating a lake level at 713 ft. asl to a number above 715 ft. asl, it's always wind affected. I have pictures of Bloodvein sitting at 723 ft. asl where the community is flooded. If you can, imagine that around the lake. Poplar River, Berens River or other communities, the lake levels are 8 feet too high in fact. There's a huge effect when the Lake Winnipeg Regulation becomes overwhelmed. I have noticed a change in water quality and changes in the environment and changes in trapping and fishing. Typically along the Cedar Lake, traditional land users are noticing the impacts out to several kilometres off the system. There are many related parts to the system and then once the water is in the system, there is no way to remove parts of the system. The cumulative effects can be identified, seen, and measured. The overall effects on the communities by cumulative effects have been documented by the communities over the last 20 years.

It is typical that the Province would provide only what is necessary or say you are too far away – in 2011 the communities all the way to Churchill were affected and that can be proven with documentation. The cumulative effects are all related to the system. Remove all the different parts of the system from the cumulative effects, it devalues the system and the process.

Talking about stockpiling for the building of the road and cutting timber, they add the value to these projects. By the time you get to the end of these hearings they are estimating that the project will come in at \$600 million, and we've already invested \$27million by building a permanent road. To cancel the project now, I know they will say that you're wasting tax payer's dollars. An OIC (Order in Council) is not typically going to cancel a route that's why they do it in creeping sub-building blocks and then they go ahead even though we're still having consultations. The Indigenous part of the consultations is slowed because a project description that was lacking and incomplete went ahead.

There are costs to doing things for some of our communities located in the region. The high water causes concerns about the potable water coming through the water treatment plant.

The province is using less than accurate technical information. You have to rely on scientific information. What we know and experienced in our communities should be primary to western science. Indigenous knowledge, where it can be used for fishing, camping, hunting, migratory birds, wildlife, medicinal plants, the amount of water, and surface water in those areas. We've lost a couple generations already and their ability to go out and then show them

how to live off the land, how to survive off the land, how to harvest and sustain your family. The majority of them have difficulty maintaining a living.

You can't replace what has been lost, damaged, and destroyed. When you listen to people saying that there are minimal impacts, there are impacts because the high water reduces the land available for use. There can be scientific studies about surface water but you can't do that without the information to make these types of determinations. It's really difficult when we look around and say, "What about this community?" we have to respect and make sure that all of those that are affected are the obligation of the federal government and they have to take it into account.

Q/C: My piece in the chat talked about human effects as part of the flood control system in Manitoba which is pre-1950 and the Lake St Martin area specifically has been impacted by the flood control system as a whole. The project is all about trying to correct the problem. They had major inputs through the Portage Diversion and creating this outlet. We should address the big elephant in the room that there needs to be a flood easement on Lake St. Martin. Little Saskatchewan, Pinaymootang and a couple of other communities, on the lake may need them (easements). MTI does not have the right, never had the right, and currently does not have the right to flood reserves as part of the Project and that is a big issue. Canada has a fiduciary responsibility to protect these reserve lands and the traditionally used lands around Little Saskatchewan and Lake St. Martin. The whole reason I'm saying the cumulative effects need to be pre-1960, particularly for the hydraulic effects, is that Manitoba did not have the right to impact the water regimes of Fisher River, Lake Manitoba, Little Saskatchewan and Dauphin River. Or to modify those flood regimes on First Nation lands and I think this needs to be straightened out right away. MTI needs to negotiate flood easements because they are project components. That's all I have to say on that topic, thank you.

R: I think part of what needs understanding is with respect to the Province negotiating agreements. It's something we need to take away and have further conversations on how the Agency may be able to support in conversations. However, with respect to this project, effects to federal land from the Project is part of the assessment. It's a complicated topic as I know you're well aware, Steve.

Q/C: Even from the changes that were already done in since the 1950s there is a change from these channels in the flood regimes in Lake St. Martin. Undoubtedly (around) Lake Manitoba many people will see a benefit but there will be a downside in drought situations to that too.

Q/C: I was displaced by the flood of 2011 and what it has done to my community has been hard to bear. I just want to mention that Manitoba has been trespassing on our territory in the way water is being stored on the land. It has affected us as we were evacuated to Winnipeg for a long time. No one mentioned in the story the CSA (Comprehensive Settlement Agreement) offered by the Province and Canada. There is a fiduciary duty for Canada to protect our infrastructure, which is part of compensation and it's a duty by Canada.

We want to be included in the payments for what is charged to store water on our land for hydro purposes. Our land is a small area on the map and it is relatively poor. We have been rebuilding but we have gained nothing. There is still a lot of work that needs to be done and we don't even have a permanent office. We've been neglected by the Province and Canada, by them failing to do their duty, so I believe that we need a partnership with Manitoba Hydro to be part of a new agreement. We need to have in place a CSA or comprehensive benefit agreement just like a Northern Flood Agreement.

The other thing I want to mention is our fishing industry. The Project has impacted our fisheries, in particular the habitat of Lake St. Martin, but the other lakes as well. All the things that are coming up due to the movement of water being diverted by Manitoba have caused our way of life to be destroyed and we need something be to be done by Canada. I feel that Canada is not fulfilling its responsibility. I believe that Lake Winnipeg has been impacted - talk to our local fish harvesters. Production has been very poor. For water coming from the south on the Red River and the City of Winnipeg, they built a new water treatment plant. They were letting the water flow from the plant

while the new water treatment plant was being dismantled. All the debris that was flowing downstream, where it accumulated. Canada should see the videos of some fish as well the frogs along the shores of Lake Winnipeg. There is a one legged frog, and this is the result of our waters being polluted. You know we shared earlier, as long as the grass grows, and the river flows. Well, our waters are being affected. Thank you.

Q/C: When we hear about the Churchill River Diversion into the Nelson River, the trappers lost sled dogs, had human casualties, and the land that benefits from the waterfowl and moose had dried up. Downstream at Jenpeg, the water speed could be moving way too fast and could harm someone. We need to examine all the cumulative effects. We shouldn't start a project until these have been discussed. We need a meeting on how it affects our people. Animals don't have food to eat and that affects our hunting. Thank you.

R: Thank you very much for those comments. I heard that the changes to water has had an impact on the ability to trap and fish and how this project may contribute to that even further. I have noted that we will have ongoing discussions with you and your community. I want to fully understand those issues.

Q/C: The IRTC represents 7 communities in the Interlake region, and for the purposes of this project we represent Kinonjeoshtegon First Nation, Lake Manitoba First Nation and Dauphin River First Nation. I appreciate all the comments made today and I share the concerns raised about the problems with this project. For a very long time and since I've been on this file all the players from IAAC and MTI have changed. The names that were there when I started on this project have changed, but what hasn't changed is the message we are hearing loud and clear - that the Project is going to happen no matter what. Most of the concerns that were raised to me have been raised before either in other meetings or in correspondence. I just want to make sure that all the changes in a meetings and in staffing, that all of those concerns that have been raised before in writing and in meetings are still incorporated into your final findings and reports.

What I've heard over the last couple years in a simple way is that this project is going to drastically affect our ability to exercise our rights. It's going to drastically affect transportation, wildlife migration, access to natural medicines, habitat, and surface water or groundwater. It's going to have many other cumulative effects. By the time this project is done it's going to cost over \$1 billion. It's only going to reduce flooding, when you weigh all those factors, I think there's got to be a better way.

R: I can say that the comments from the people who are and have been on the project are part of the record. Those comments will inform the reports. I can say for this project, with respect to the potential effects, that interests and rights are being taken into account.

Health break

Manitoba and Transportation joined the meeting to discuss the Project with the TAG.

MTI: I just want to start by making some opening remarks and I'm going to turn it over. Good afternoon everyone and thank you for your time in allowing MTI to participate in today's meeting.

I would like to start by saying that MTI recognizes the importance of the environmental approval process and the need to understand the impacts of the project in the planning stages. We also recognize that we need to work together to identify potential problems before they occur, and also look at ways to mitigate harm before a project moves forward. MTI considers the proposed Outlet Channels project to be a very important project for the province. Manitoba continues to experience record flood events and is expected to be subjected to more extreme weather events in the future. And Climate change projections further reinforces the urgency of mitigation projects such as the Outlet Channels. We believe, without this infrastructure in place, flood damages will be more severe and more frequent in the future. The proposed Project will provide improved, permanent flood protection for both Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin. And our intent is to provide a design that meets flood protection commitments,

maximizes flood protection benefits, minimizes environmental impacts, and at a reasonable cost for Manitobans. While the proposed Project will not eliminate the risk of future floods, it will lessen the impact of these flood events and allow for more effective management of water levels on both lakes, providing flood mitigation to communities in the project area.

MTI has been working alongside many of you since 2018 to address all of the Information Requests and refine the many Environment Management Plans that have been developed. And this is ongoing through consultation and community engagement. Based on some of the feedback heard, we have been able to incorporate a number of mitigations to the proposed Project. Some examples include realigning the channels to avoid regional effects on groundwater; armoring of both channels to minimize erosion; and Incorporating base flow in channels to minimize effects to fish and fish habitat.

Today we will provide some additional details on our plans for responding to IRs and ongoing consultation and engagement as we work through community specific concerns and the round two information requests. I'd like to reiterate, we are committed to ongoing engagement and consultation that is both meaningful and productive for all parties as we work through the regulatory process. We have learned a lot through this process to dates and as a result our approach to consultation has changed for the better and we continue to strive to do better. We look forward to continuing to work alongside all of you as we progress with the proposed Outlet Channels project.

MTI: I just want to thank the Agency and also the representatives that have helped us get to where we're at and where we're going. To reiterate, we want to do it together. So building on the last meetings, we have ongoing collaboration and communication between both MTI and all the groups that are working on this project. Whether it be federal agencies or environmental regulatory bodies. I'll just give a brief history in terms of where we've come from, where we're at now and where we're going, and we'll be having follow-up meetings with all the people represented on the call. We have a plan to share and we will be discussing those things in terms of how to work together.

I'm just going to recap very quickly, about things that pretty much everyone is aware of, but I think I want to put a perspective on what's going on. We know it's no surprise that the demand has come for the project as a result of the 2011 flood. The studies and work between 2012 and 2014 was done as a follow-up to the 2011 flood. This included the Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Regulation Review Committee, 2011 Flood Task Force, and Assiniboine River and Lake Manitoba Basin Flood Mitigation Study. They conducted assessments on several project alternatives, including various potential alternative routes. Based on this, in 2014-2015, a preferred option was selected. From 2015 to 2017, more information was gathered to support the environment impact assessment; the project description information was provided to the Agency in 2018. MTI then engaged consulting firms that conducted the environmental impact assessment that was initially submitted to the Agency in August 2019. After the conformity review, it was resubmitted in the spring 2020. I'm not sure whether people have had a chance to look at all the details of the impact assessment but it does form the basis of the ongoing questions and responses from MTI and our team. We have shared those details on the Project throughout this process and have worked towards further enhancing the project. We're learning how best to work with everybody on the call more effectively. That's all part of this whole process that we're all in the mist of, whether it pertains to groundwater, surface water, plants or wildlife, we will continue to work with you in addressing those questions and any outstanding concerns.

MTI: I know that there were several questions and concerns raised over the last several years. MTI continues to make strides to work collaboratively with communities on issues of concern. With that, we shared the draft of the (environmental) management plans, for example, in 2020 and sought feedback; MTI did get feedback that we integrated into the most recent versions of IR responses in spring and EMPs in June 2022. When we looked at all the really helpful comments and questions, it's a good way to test if we're missing anything. In the Project we will try to address those that have been submitted in the spring in the first round of information requests.

I'd like to think that most of us have the same overall goal to have the best possible flood mitigation project. As you all know, our job is to get this done, so the question is where do we go from here? Consultation staff will talk about where we are at from a consultation perspective. This has been a new chapter in the last year or so and we want to continue to make it right with you and to provide the opportunity to talk and provide feedback. We have meetings that are coming up and with respect to the round one information requests; there are good technical questions and concerns that people have shared and MTI are in process of addressing. We've identified that and we're trying to line up the best responses we can and we are also going to use the information to make the best project. That includes the mitigation measures we have proposed to date and additional mitigation and monitoring that arise from the concerns that were raised. Along with the information requests from the different communities, we had to do some additional work. The development of a wetland monitoring plan, for example, is a new addition. That comes out of the fact that people were asking a lot of questions and expressed concerns regarding wetlands. MTI recognizes that this is a very important topic.

MTI and our team have lots of internal technical discussions before we meet with you and we make every effort to meet as soon as we have information to share. We are trying our best to share with you right now; even though we don't have a technical expert here today, we certainly can take back any questions and get a response to you. MTI received information requests, which are good and challenging questions and require time to digest. We are developing plans to respond to those questions for the Round 2 (information requests). That's why I said that coming out of those important technical questions - whether it's surface water, groundwater, wetlands or wildlife - there may be a need to have more meetings with you before we even file our responses on the second round and talk about the specifics on some of those technical questions. We will be looking to schedule those meetings over the coming months as we work through the information requests. The extended schedule is still not a lot of time, so once we submit our responses to Round 2 we will want to meet on them. We're hopeful that your responses will form an important part of our plan to work collaboratively with everybody on the call through this process and make sure we all understand your questions and comments.

And yes, we want to receive the federal approval. IAAC will write a report and there will be a feedback opportunity before the finalization of their report. There are a lot of different points of feedback and processing of your comments. MTI expects that an Agency decision statement will have Project-related conditions. That is going to make sure commitments are kept and they are important and effective for the construction of this project, how it is actually operated, and where we have preconstruction requirements such as finalizing EMPs. For many other past projects, these management plans are required in advance of construction but often not available before Provincial licensing and Federal approvals are granted.

MTI and our team worked towards being transparent and providing you all this information early; this also allows EMPs to more specifically be integrated into licensing and approvals, assisting with finalizing the environmental regulatory process. MTI wants to work together with you and just want to make sure we understand the questions. If we need to change or add some things to our overall program to further enhance the project, those are all good things. I appreciate this process - sometimes it takes longer than people think - but we just want to do this right. So if you have any questions now I'm happy to answer what I can, otherwise I'll just pass it on to MTI's consultation representative and he'll provide you an update on engagement and what's going on with consultation.

MTI: I just want to start by saying thank you for the invitation. I want to reiterate what was said by the other MTI representatives that there has been a significant effort put forward to working with communities.

I have five talking points. I can provide you with the introduction of the indigenous consultation branch. Our new team has eight staff and there's going to be a newsletter on that. I want to talk a little bit about the approach on the federal side when it comes to engagement and then I want to talk about the consultation requirements. I do want to highlight with this project, as well as other projects, at this point in time is the federal legislation. Along with the

federal environmental assessment process for this Project, MTI must also be considerate of provincial regulatory requirements for Project approvals. For the provincial process, for the Interim Consultation policy is the mechanism that deals with provincial Section 35 Aboriginal and Treaty rights. We will not be operating under the new federal Impact Assessment Act that's looming in the background, however, we will be incorporating its principles for this process. Additionally, MTI is also working on a new consultation policy, which will be launched soon but is being taken into account for current approaches. So for this project, we are at a juncture whether we're going to operate under old legislation or the new policies or new legislation, in any case we will be better. We're not trying to change the Project or try to get away with anything. We're trying to get the best information to the communities in a timely manner. So the one piece that I wanted to highlight is the legislation piece.

When it comes to MTI's consultation approach, we are going to provide as much information as we can and work with communities to ensure everything follows due process. We have the obligation to share information, provide responses, and to enhance the relationships with the public. We want to cooperate and share perspectives from the public at large into this project. So that's one approach that we're taking – it is a very broad public type of approach.

When you flip the switch on to the provincial consultation side and talk about Section 35 we're talking Aboriginal consultation. We're talking directly to the First Nations and Metis. When we talk about consultation that's exactly what we're talking about. That's very much a rights-holder piece; we want to talk with communities and have real two-way dialogue. We want to talk about the impact to those rights and the reporting of the project, planning, and design that is put together by engineers and consultants. The real point that I'm trying to make is we want to make sure the First Nations and rights-holders understand the Project and if there's a better way for us to explain that in what impacts your Indigenous / Aboriginal treaty rights. So I want to highlight what the message we got back from those meetings over the summer when we met with a lot of community leaders. The message that we got back from those meetings was that MTI Deputy Ministers (DMs) and senior-level leaders need to meet more with them. The message was heard so from now until the end of the calendar year we're trying to set up community meetings and present this information.

As the MTI Environmental team alluded to earlier, this is about the subject matter of the IR responses. I want to get to that right now. That's on the list, the whole approach is using an open house format, we're talking with community leaders here we're trying to get back to them on whether the open house format works or whether it's a town hall approach or whether it's a panel. We want to know what type of meeting you want, what type of format, and whether we are wanted to come to the community. That's whether the members wanted to have a community dialogue happening. We encourage you to take this message to your members and ask those questions.

The round two information requests that are being prepared and filed to the Agency; those are key milestone steps. I can't tell you those specific dates when submissions are made to the Agency. There's a lot of information in there and we're going to be referring to that. A lot of specialist or technical responses provide that information. That's a real key step in the dialogue. I know we have differences that we have to work through. That's always a part of consultation. Know that everything gets recorded by us in consultation. Whether it comes from discussion or whether it's in writing, MTI will still provide a record. I don't want to say there aren't some other milestones ahead, we want to work with you. There's one thing we've been working on so we've been trying efforts to have more in person meetings. The other one is the status of responses to these questions. There's going to be a lot of information with the IR written responses. We're responding to IRs from round one in writing to you. We will be filing a response to that and that's best for us in the engagement. I mention process but when it comes to Section 35 (Constitution Act 1982) it'll be one big submission from MTI to the groups. It's a very standard practice, we send a record of communication and then we also send a summary of our prior responses. That's a very standard process that's going to be upcoming in the next little while. During the 17 month extension we will reply to more correspondence so we don't run out of time. So there are going to be responses forthcoming. Then there's the general consultation; all comprehensive questions. It's a process and MTI providing information is going to be required by law.

It is the next meeting to go through what will be needed for the Environmental Advisory Committee. Thursday afternoon, is in-person here so that's one of those meetings where we are being inclusive to groups impacted by this project and includes the RM (of Grahamdale). These two channels, we had our meeting three weeks ago at the end of September there, September 28 I believe, so this meeting that's coming up on Thursday is another to be sure that we understand one another. Kind of taking a step back and exploring models. We heard you loud and clear. We're not trying to control this file and we want to have a discussion of the models that were talked about so that's happening on Thursday afternoon. We want to make sure we propose the EAC as a part of this project and we want to make sure that it does not go away or some mechanism of that function is still within the project. So that is very important. It can go forward based on consensus. You know, like the other groups working together because this project has a huge footprint and there's multiple Nations involved. That's the real message from my group. We want to be seen working together.

That's the whole purpose of the steps with this larger group. To make it working together. There are a lot of things that we have to talk through. Whether you are concerned with the EAC or whether it's heritage I want to make sure this new EAC is set up right, in with you First Nations so on Thursday that's we want to do with you. I think I had all the points I wanted to hit.

Q/C: *from chat* - what is the timeline for responding to the current package?

R - MTI: We are not able to provide an exact timeline but we're working together to determine the various aspects of the technical information and impacts as well. We are still developing our plan and timeline for submitting answers and we're diligently working on that.

R - MTI: We will continue to work over the winter and likely all in Q1 2023 but again don't have the exact timing.

Q/C: *from chat* - Is the Thursday EAC meeting invitation only? Can participation be via Zoom or phone? MTI attendee contact information?

R - MTI: Yes the Thursday meeting is invitation only. Whether or not we will open that up still needs to be discussed. It is a consensus-based approach, once we get the ball rolling then we might open it up.

Right now it is invitation only. We will have the committee determine how and who are invited.

When communities want to be virtual we will provide that. For the upcoming meeting on Thursday we are encouraging in person attendance but virtual attendance is possible.

Q/C: If we go back to 2016, we asked at one of our meetings if all First Nations going to have a say where the Channels will be built. Now, the government wants our input on the Lake Manitoba preferred route. I mentioned earlier that the First Nations have unfinished business with the Province and Canada. We had a couple of court cases at the Queen's Bench of Manitoba and in Federal Court that are not complete. I would like to thank George for his comments and note that subsection 9.1 of the *Water Resources Administration Act* says the Province can take land for any public purpose or interest. This is an interest to Manitoba as a holding pond. As for the public interest there's nothing in there for peoples' interest. What resource sharing are we getting to benefit our local nations as well? Canada is bound by Section 35 (*Constitution Act, 1982*) and the developments so far have been without consent. The flooding of reserve land, meaning our community of Lake St. Martin, an easement is sought for the flooding. Now I find a problem with 806 (ft. asl) and there still compensation owing for our community. That is of concern to us. There is no water resource legislation so they're going back to the NRTA of 1930. We were never properly consulted. All the First Nations across the Prairie Provinces, we were never consulted. Canada was supposed to protect our interests. Canada failed to protect our interest.

R-MTI: I have heard you and written these points down. We can get back to you about the Act. I want to be very clear in all the communications on the NTRA.

I'm trying to make sure we're adding more messages to ensure the other pieces are very clear. Chronic flooding in the Interlake area, that's a very clear piece on what the interest here is. On sharing, we talked about resource sharing mechanisms, arrangements with other impact agreements because there's no agreement here. We have what we have in our toolbox and the EAC is one of those mechanisms that we can work through. The further studies that we have planned for the proposed project are during construction and during operation so that's one of those things we are trying to get up and running. We heard that we need to change the Project to meet the needs of people. So that's my response to that. I can refer to where we spoke to that in the in the submission from MTI.

At the time of the EIS submission, this project wasn't where it is today. There wasn't even an idea and back prior to 2016 it wasn't on the horizon for the CSA negotiations to include the Project. For the last piece about the Project, the question is very large. It's not going to be resolved through consultation. Best we can do is write it down for our legal staff as it's the first time you've mentioned it. I've heard it, we will write this down, and record it. We try and respond the best we can.

As for the Project storing water for electricity, we want to continue to reinforce the messaging that again, this is a project meant to protect Manitobans in the area and not for hydro.

R-MTI: Now what George mentioned about the CSA, the team is aware of those but we're not directly involved in those negotiations. We have had discussions with and met with provincial and federal levels to try to understand it but are not involved in any way with the negotiations, which are completely out of scope for my team.

Q/C: Your colleague mentioned the project concept, between 2015 and 2017. From what I understand, it is the information from the 2011 flood review and watershed studies are what you're relying on for this project. That was a starting point.

R-MTI: Those did come from 2016. A number of other projects were assessed to determine this project. However, I wouldn't have been involved as I was not here.

Q/C: Water movement between Saskatchewan and Manitoba in 2011, was that included in the reviews?

R-MTI: Not sure, but we can provide you additional information.

Q/C: Moot point in continuing the Project if those weren't included. Hydro use, in the 2006 study commissioned by the Province, in the 2002-2007 assessment, Manitoba Hydro indicated it was the second source for power generation. Based on that you would get the idea that it is a revenue generating source.

R-MTI: The channels are independent of Manitoba Hydro so when I said that's not meant to be used for generation, that is the case. It's not designed or meant to be used for those purposes. Again that is not the intent of our project. The fact is that the Lake Manitoba watershed it is not being used for an energy operating system.

Q/C: In 2017 the watershed was in drought, it caused Manitoba hydro to offset the lack of water into Lake Winnipeg. Manitoba Hydro stores water in the South Indian Lake Reservoir in order to augment the lack of water flowing into the Nelson system. The Lake Manitoba area also recorded...

R-MTI: I'm just I'm just going to jump in here. In my experience, the water power for this project... we're not using the *Water Power Act*. So I think if this was a water power generating project that would be the appropriate legislation. I can tell you right now when we do water power generation in this province, legislation - and there's two really important points and this is very relevant is - I understand we use water power reserve and water power rights

and there's only a water power license on this one. On Lake Winnipeg and Nelson Rivers because that's where Hydro regulates. I think it's very misconstrued that this is a hydro generating project.

Q/C: I am not down with the idea that the *Water Power Act* and water regulation is different because when you look at what you're trying to do with this outlet channel, you know that's part of the water regulation.

R-MTI: I'm going to jump in there again. The hydro needs are very different and a huge mischaracterization of the proposed Project and the misconception that it is related to hydroelectricity production by Manitoba Hydro . The project is very specifically flood mitigation.

Facilitator: I'm looking at the time and we don't have a time for it. I've got to two other people with questions and we are already over our time limit. I need to move on.

Q/C: Thank you very much for the opportunity to meet with you. I would like to thank MTI, your staff for coming to the community and answering our questions on May 12. Our first consultation meeting we were really pleased but we have not received the provincial record of that meeting at this time and there was a number of questions that were tabled at the meeting. I was of the understanding that we would probably get responses back but nonetheless we've not received any response that I'm aware of. My question to you is, can we expect a provincial record of the meeting and official responses to the community's questions?

R-MTI: Steve and I, we do agree it was a good meeting. They are developing the records of the meetings and have actioned some questions. The meeting record and communication should be coming but I can't give an exact timeline. Are there any particular questions you have in mind right now?

Q/C: No I think I should respond officially as they were the community's specific questions. Thank you.

Q/C: I want to talk a little bit about our Treaties and concerns – Treaty #5 – our livelihood – I am not hearing about fishing and other things. We are not talking about the important issues. The communities are not involved to tell all of you listening where we get somewhere that addresses our wants and needs. You are talking to a spirit, or about a spirit, it doesn't make me feel good.

I am part of Treaty number 5, I speak with the spirit I think that's involved in the Treaty area. Where I belong I have a problem with that because I've been fishing 50 years. I don't see the participation of other Treaty 5 Nations, the municipalities, the groups like Grand Rapids and those most affected by the Project.

R-MTI: Thank you for that comment. We have identified so far 10 of the 39 communities most likely to be impacted. The MTI consultation team will continue to reach out and we certainly welcome feedback. We are putting additional resources to this project and to help and support is of the utmost importance to us and our project team. We want to continue to work collaboratively but have been focussing recently with groups closely impacted by the Project and are closer to the project area.

Q/C: *Chat question* - In the introduction it was stated that the Province is expected to be subjected to more severe flooding events in the future and that this project will lessen the effects of future flood events. Are there any areas where you think this project could make future flood events worse?

R-MTI: In the EIS, the purpose is managing and keeping lake levels and flows and the durations of those flood events to be less on Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin. We are working on an on-going assessment of effects to Lake Winnipeg. (This includes) cumulative effects on the communities and fish habitat.

Agency: I just really want to reiterate my opening comment that we really appreciate you taking the time to be here today. We will ensure that next time there will be an opportunity for the TAG to discuss as a group. We don't have

any timing on that right now but once we get to that point will make sure that that we afford that space at the start of our next TAG for people to come together. I wish you a wonderful rest of your Tuesday and it was a pleasure to be here and listen to you.

CLOSING PRAYER

The October 18, 2022 Technical Advisory Group Meeting concluded at approximately 3:52 p.m. A Closing Prayer was offered.

Chat Window Comments

The following comments (unedited) were provided in the videoconference chat window:

- Was there any attention given to mitigation plans for interruptions/changes to our cellular services when the camps are active and bringing in twice the amount of people we usually have in our communities? We are already in an area of poor cell service, additional drawing on those services will affect our residents.
- Conway from Fox Lake here, I have an issue with "integration of traditional knowledge". Most baselines are created from local and historical knowledge and science is based off of that. Example, any western science studies will need local and historical knowledge to determine when and where to do research. My point is TK should not be considered as an "add-on" to western science. It should be the other way around and use traditional knowledge as the baseline
- If MTI is allowed to depressurize the ground water, it's going to displace 10,000 ha of wetland. If that's not the biggest concern to the terrestrial life, I don't know what is.
- My understanding is that wetland compensation can be created anywhere in the province and there is nothing stipulating that the compensation is done in the areas that lost wetlands.
- The 23 km right of way for the LMOC is currently a water discharge zone. If MTI is allowed to depressurize the aquifer, will the area turn into a water recharge zone? Will surface water be allowed to enter the aquifer?
- Tera, FRCN has insisted that wetland compensation projects be in the impacted area and that local communities be involved. MTI had agreed to this verbally - need to check if any confirmation by e-mail.
- Should the IAAC recommendations to the Federal Minister not include the minimum Provincial regulations as well?
- Can IAAC ask the Proponent to reissue the EIS with all the changes, answers to information requests and supporting plans?
- Greg's comment about the project description is important. The project description should clearly explain the reasons for this proposal within the context of the whole existing flood and drought control system, and not be a PR exercise to obtain approval to go ahead. The project description on the web page right now is not fully transparent.
- Has MTI filed all the reports from their Government web site with IAAC? OR have they been filed as answers to information requests?
<https://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/wms/lmbismoutlets/resources/reports.html>
- The accumulative effects should be assessed based on pre provincial flood control system. ie pre1960. The Province is trying to correct the impacts of the current flood control system by building this project. The full impacts should be evaluated from the Assiniboine dikes, Shellmouth reservoir, Portage Diversion and Fairford control structure as to how they have changed Lake Manitoba, Lake St Martin and Lake Winnipeg water level regimes and the Fairford river and Dauphin river flow regimes. The People of Manitoba and FN communities need to have an understanding of the total cumulative impact of the Provincial Flood Control System.
- Derek - curious. What was the makeup of the consultation team from the MB Government? All MTI staff or others?
- Based on experience I don't think that MB Gov and MTI care what IAAC and the guidelines says about consultation. They made the decision back in 2017 that MTI would be part of the Provincial Crown-

Aboriginal Consultation team, even though they are the Proponent. Information from participants makes it clear that the Proponent plans on building the channels.

- Maybe IAAC could also ask MTI to explain in detail how the LMLSMOC would influence hydroelectric operations if this has not already been clearly detailed in the submissions.
- Canada needs to settle all Cumulative impacts and adverse affected First Nations and community legal claims?
- The degradation of wetlands in the vicinity of the proposed channels will add to the poorer quality wetlands that have already resulted from water control structures in the watershed. The cumulative effects then need to be understood across the landscape of this type of degradation to wildlife and treaty rights holders.
- Given Jay's statements earlier today about this project and the consultation process being in the very early stages and that approval of the project is not a certainty, I would like to hear IAAC's (and specifically Jay's) thoughts/response to MTI's characterization of this as an "approval process" and clearly thinking the project approval and construction is a foregone conclusion. IAAC and MTI seem to be on very different pages in that regard
- I agree Matt -- I'd also like to know MTI's perspective on the 2012 CEAA guidelines and whether they will abide by them fully
- Hello, my name is Kimberley Keller representing Little Saskatchewan First Nation - What is MTI's anticipated timeline for responding to the current package of "second round" IRs?
- In the introduction, it was stated that the province is expected to be subjected to more severe flooding events in the future, and that this project will lessen the effects of future flood events. Are there any areas where you think this project could make future flood events worse?
- My understanding is that none of the First Nations, groups, and communities that are represented on this call want this project. How does MTI reconcile that with its position that the project is in the public's interest?

Acronym List

ASL – Above sea level

CEAA - Canadian Environmental Assessment Act

DFO - Department of Fisheries and Oceans

EA - Environmental Assessment

ECCC - Environment and Climate Change Canada

EOC – Emergency Outlet Channels

EIS - Environmental Impact Statement

EMP - Environmental Monitoring Program

IAA – Impact Assessment Act

IAAC/Agency - Impact Assessment Agency of Canada

IR - Information Request

MMF - Manitoba Métis Federation

MTI/Proponent - Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure

NRTA – Natural Resources Transfer Act

Project - Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channels Project

TAG - Technical Advisory Group

Attendees

Members/Representatives	
Misipawistik Cree Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tyler Lavallee - Devon McLeod - Derek Kornelson - Kirsten Earl McCorrister - Ian Halket 	Peguis First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Floyd Flett - Roberta Flett - Mike Sutherland - Ian Halket
RM of Grahamdale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steve Topping - Jason Bittner - Tera Lobay 	Keewatinook Fishers of Lake Winnipeg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Henry Traverse - Chris Colombo - Greg McGivov
Interlake Reserves Tribal Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seetta Rocolla 	York Factory First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adam Kroeker
Lake St. Martin First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mervin Sinclair - Steve Topping - Alex Traverse - Dion Traverse 	Fisher River Cree Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harley Jonasson - Corey Murdock
Tataskweyak Cree Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matt Boulton 	Norway House Cree Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annette Luttermann - Loretta Mowatt
Little Saskatchewan First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kimberly Keller 	Poplar River First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jared Whelan
Manitoba Métis Federation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marci Riel - Jade Dewar 	Pimicikamak Okimawin <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annette Luttermann - Darrell Settee
Sandy Bay First Nation, Sagkeeng First Nation, and Pinaymootang First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grant Wallace 	Berens River First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paul Disbrowe
Hollow Water First Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blake Russell 	Fox Lake Cree Nation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conway Arthurson
Additional Participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shania Geisler 	

Federal Government Representatives	
Transport Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roslyn King - Jackie Barker 	Health Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Julie Anderson
Fisheries and Oceans Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rick Gervais - Jeff Moyer 	Infrastructure Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jared Bone - Meaghan Ferguson
Natural Resources Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peter Unger - Vikash Narine 	Environment and Climate Change Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cari-Lyn Epp - Gillian Brown
Indigenous Services Canada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cassandra Kalyniuk 	

Impact Assessment Agency of Canada
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sean Carriere - Ian Martin - Jay Gerritsen - Greg Bosse - Shelly Boss - Tracy Lachine - Jane Stringham - Ashley Hart - Mark Bowler

Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure (Joined at 3:30 PM)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amna Mackie - Blair McMahon - Edwin Mitchell - George Ryle - Jamie Smith