

Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channels Project – Technical Review Information Requests Round 3

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym or Abbreviation	Definition
AIS	Aquatic Invasive Species
ARU	Autonomic Recording Unit
CCME	Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment
CEC	Clean Environment Commission
EA	Environmental Assessment
EAC	Environmental Advisory Committee
ECCC	Environment and Climate Change Canada
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EWPW	Eastern Whip-poor-will
HADD	Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
EOC	Emergency Outlet Channel
HRIA	Heritage Resource Impact Assessment
IAAC	Impact Assessment Agency of Canada
IRTC	Interlake Reserves Tribal Council
LAA	Localized Assessment Area
LMOC	Lake Manitoba Outlet Channel
LSMOC	Lake St. Martin Outlet Channel
MTI	Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure
m ³ /sec	Cubic Metres per Second
NRCan	Natural Resources Canada
PDA	Project Development Area
PTH	Provincial Trunk Highway
RAA	Regional Assessment Area
RM	Rural Municipality
ROW	Right of Way
SARA	The <i>Species at Risk Act</i>
TSS	Total Suspended Sediments
TWCR	Temporary Winter Construction Road
VC	Valued Component

Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channels Project – Technical Review Information Requests Round 3

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
IAAC-R3-01	IAAC-R2-01 IAAC-R2-07 IAAC-R2-08 IAAC-R2-09 IAAC-R2-10 IAAC-R2-11 IAAC-R2-14 IAAC-R2-26 IAAC-R2-29	Berens River First Nation Bloodvein First Nation Dakota Tipi First Nation DFO Fisher River Cree Nation IAAC Interlake Reserves Tribal Council Little Saskatchewan First Nation Misipawistik Cree Nation Norway House Cree Nation Pinaymootang First Nation Poplar River First Nation RM of Grahamdale Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation	7.1.4 Groundwater and Surface Water 7.1.5 Fish and fish habitat 7.1.10 Indigenous Peoples 7.1.6 Aquatic Invasive Species 7.2.2 Changes to groundwater, surface water, and fluvial morphology 7.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments 7.2.4 Aquatic Invasive Species 7.3.1 Fish and fish habitat 7.3.3 Indigenous Peoples 7.4 Mitigation measures 9. Monitoring and Follow up Programs	<p>The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Guidelines require the Proponent to identify any potential adverse effects to fish and fish habitat due to changes in water quality and sediment quality as a result of storing water in, and releasing water from one lake to another and from the channels. The EIS Guidelines also require the Proponent to assess changes to the environment on Indigenous groups’ socio-economic conditions, including commercial fishing, recreational use and food security.</p> <p>Fish and Fish Habitat The response to IAAC-R2-07 states that the changes to flow, water levels and water velocity during channel operations will have little effect on fish and fish habitat in the Narrows and north basin of Lake St. Martin. However, the water velocities through the Narrows during operations are expected to increase erosion and transport sediments into the downstream areas of the Narrows and north basin of Lake St. Martin. Indigenous groups have identified potential effects to fishing for food, social, ceremonial, and commercial purposes, and have stated that the Lake St. Martin Narrows and north basin of Lake St. Martin contain critical fish habitat that must be protected. An assessment of the Total Suspended Sediments (TSS) concentrations of the sediment plume expected to form as flow exits the Narrows into the north basin of Lake St. Martin is needed to assess the potential effects on fish and fish habitat, and to the current use of lands and resources for traditional purposes by Indigenous Peoples (current use).</p> <p>To assess potential effects on fish and fish habitat, information is needed about the amount of fish habitat that would be lost due to the increased erosion, transport and deposition of sediment resulting from the higher water velocities.</p> <p>The response to IAAC-R2-29 mentions project-related changes to resource use, including commercial activities that Indigenous people are engaged in such as fishing. PRFN noted that the Clean Environment Commission (CEC) Lake Winnipeg Regulation record includes maps to show where Indigenous fishing occurs.</p> <p>Water and Sediment The response to IAAC-R2-07 and IAAC-R2-10 relies on modeling for the initial commissioning event to assess potential residual environmental effects of the Project on valued components (VCs). Although understanding the severity of potential effects during initial commissioning is critical, less data has been compiled for sediment models during operation activities for future flood events. Potential effects to fish and fish habitat from sediment deposition and transport, including a discussion of potential death of fish related to project activities, has not been adequately assessed for initial commissioning and operation of the outlet channels. Further details on potential effects to whitefish and walleye spawning grounds located in Birch Bay and Sturgeon Bay, food sources including re-distribution of fish and the ability to forage for both benthic and pelagic food sources, and migration patterns are required. Additionally, the response to IAAC-R2-07 suggests that there may be circumstances in which quantities of sediment mobilized and measured during initial channel commissioning may be less or more than modeled, which introduces potential risk that sediment may be mobilized into receiving environments during subsequent operations.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Describe the potential geographical extent and TSS concentrations of the sediment plume exiting the Lake St. Martin Narrows into the north basin of Lake St. Martin during initial commissioning and operation of the outlet channels. b. Describe how the assessment of potential effects of sediment to fish and fish habitat in the Lake St. Martin Narrows and north basin of Lake St. Martin considered Indigenous Knowledge and was incorporated into the assessment of potential effects to Indigenous Peoples’ socio-economic conditions and current use. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide a rationale for differences between quantitative assessments of potential effects of sediment deposition and transport on fish and fish habitat and Indigenous Knowledge shared on this subject. ii. Given the Indigenous Knowledge shared, provide an updated assessment of cumulative effects of sediment deposition and transport on fish and fish habitat in the Regional Assessment Area (RAA). c. Provide an assessment of effects to fishing activities from the Project given the CEC Lake Winnipeg Regulation record. d. Discuss whether fish harvesting and commercial fishing will be limited at the inlets and outlets of the LMOC and LSMOC. e. Discuss potential effects of project operation resulting in more sediment mobilization than anticipated, and provide resulting effects to related VCs, including but not limited to, the effects of sediment deposition on fish and fish habitat, including spawning, rearing and migration patterns, and the ability to forage for benthic and pelagic food sources. f. Describe monitoring programs that could include the following locations: Berens Island, Pigeon Bay, Sandy Bar, Black Island, Hecla Island (Icelandic River), and all bays (e.g., Goldeye Creek, Fisher Bay) and peninsulas that make up the “Narrows” connected to the North Basin of Lake Winnipeg Reservoir. g. Describe the likelihood that not all of the sediment present in the outlet channels during construction and prior to commissioning is flushed out into receiving waterbodies during commissioning. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Describe the likelihood that sediment concentrations would exceed Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) guidelines and describe the effects on fish and fish habitat, if sediment is flushed in operational events after the commissioning period. ii. Describe the full suite of technically and economically feasible mitigation measures to remove the maximum amount of sediment from the channels prior to commissioning activities. h. Provide an assessment of the likelihood of project activities to result in fish mortality. Include risk of death of fish related to proposed mitigation

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
		Tataskweyak Cree Nation		<p>Understanding the potential for deposition through sediment accumulation over multiple flood events is essential for assessing potential long-term effects to fish and fish habitat. Indigenous groups have identified potential long-term effects on fish and fish habitat and to current use due to the transport and deposition of sediment on the lakebed from the operation of flood management infrastructure. The Proponent has expanded monitoring plans to include McBeth Point and Reindeer Island, however additional monitoring locations are required to verify predictions about potential downstream effects.</p> <p>A revised evaluation of sediment transport and deposition that considers operation beyond initial commissioning is required to understand potential effects to fish and fish habitat and current use. Mitigation measures for potential effects to fish abundance and the availability and efficiency of fishing practices are required.</p> <p>Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) The EIS guidelines require the Proponent to describe potential adverse effects of the Project associated with the introduction and/or spread of AIS.</p> <p>The response to IAAC-R2-27 asserts that mitigation measures are not necessary to reduce the potential spread of zebra mussels into Lake St. Martin, as zebra mussels will be “expected to colonize Lake St. Martin prior to commissioning of the outlet channels”. Given the potential for zebra mussels to colonize Lake St. Martin based on their existing presence in Lake Manitoba and considering that the proposed Project is likely to directly contribute to the speed and extent to which zebra mussels colonize Lake St. Martin, it is important to analyse the potential effects on fish and fish habitat as well as current use. Indigenous groups have identified concerns around the potential for flood events to convey zebra mussels and zebra mussel shells along the Lake Manitoba Outlet Channel (LMOC) and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channel (LSMOC), with shells likely to deposit at the outlet of each channel.</p>	<p>measures that may not be fully effective, such as fish salvage efforts, fish stranding and winter oxygen levels in the outlet channels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Include details on dredging activities related to inlet and outlet construction for the LMOC and LSMOC. Calculate the potential for fish deaths due to dredging and the use of cofferdams. ii. Discuss potential sediment and contaminant deposits during dredging, construction, commissioning, and operation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide details on how a flood event could affect the potential spread of zebra mussels, including introduction into Lake St. Martin. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Discuss any input from Indigenous groups and provincial authorities on zebra mussels and their potential to spread in the RAA. ii. Assess the likelihood and timing of AIS spread for each phase of the Project to determine potential effects on fish and fish habitat, and Indigenous Peoples’ current use and socio-economic conditions. iii. Discuss the likelihood of deposition of zebra mussel shells at the outlets of the LMOC and LSMOC after a major flood operation. iv. If shell deposition were to occur after flood operations within the LMOC and LSMOC, describe the potential effects on fish and fish habitat, and Indigenous Peoples’ current use and socio-economic conditions. j. Provide a description of any technically and economically feasible mitigation measures that could be utilized to prevent or reduce the spread of zebra mussels to Lake St. Martin. Provide a description of how these mitigation measures support Indigenous fishing rights.
IAAC-R3-02	IAAC-R2-02 IAAC-R2-13 IAAC-R2-14	Berens River First Nation Bloodvein First Nation DFO ECCC Fisher River Cree Nation IAAC Interlake Reserves Tribal Council	7.1.4 Groundwater and Surface Water 7.1.5 Fish and fish habitat 7.1.7 Riparian, Wetland and Terrestrial Environments 7.1.8 Migratory birds and their habitat 7.1.9 Species at Risk	<p>The EIS Guidelines require an assessment of forecasted changes in the quantity of groundwater discharging to surface water. The EIS Guidelines also require the Proponent to assess plant and animal species (abundance, distribution and diversity) and their habitats, with a focus on species at risk or with special status that are of social, economic, cultural or scientific significance. The EIS Guidelines also require the Proponent to describe changes to critical habitat for federally listed species at risk, changes to habitat connectivity, and changes to shorelines and riparian areas. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to identify any potential direct and indirect adverse effects to migratory birds or their habitat, including staging and nesting areas, foraging grounds, and landing sites. The assessment should consider changes to the environment that may affect local movement and seasonal habitat use, any direct habitat loss, the potential for habitat fragmentation, loss of connectivity or other change causing a reduction of habitat quality. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess the potential effects of the project on federally listed species at risk and their critical habitat, including the direct and indirect effects on the survival or recovery of federally listed species.</p> <p>Groundwater Modeling and Discharge Rates To support this assessment, IAAC-R2-02 requested information on the quantity of groundwater that discharges to surface to the north of the LSMOC (Buffalo Creek and associated wetlands).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reassess the analytical modelling used to calculate the long-term flow of groundwater into the LSMOC to ensure consistency with the recent seasonally high field observations in Reach 3 presented in IAAC-R2-02. b. Quantify baseline groundwater discharge to the creeks and wetlands to the north/northwest of the LSMOC (Buffalo Creek Complex and the associated wetlands). c. Reassess the change in groundwater discharge to surface water within the wetlands and creeks to the north/northwest of the LSMOC based on the updated assessment of groundwater inflow to the channel, and the updated baseline groundwater discharge estimates. d. Clarify whether removing the rewatering element from the Project would alter the Environmental Assessment (EA) predictions or conclusions regarding water quality, aquatic biota and species at risk habitat. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Describe the nature and extent of any such changes to EA predictions and conclusions resulting from the decision not to rewater and provide supporting information.

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
		<p>Misipawistik Cree Nation</p> <p>NRCan</p> <p>Pinaymootang First Nation</p> <p>Poplar River First Nation</p> <p>RM of Grahamdale</p> <p>Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation</p> <p>Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation</p>	<p>7.1.10 Indigenous Peoples</p> <p>7.2.2 Changes to groundwater, surface water, and fluvial morphology</p> <p>7.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments</p> <p>7.3.2 Migratory birds</p> <p>7.3.5 Species at risk</p> <p>7.4 Mitigation measures</p> <p>9. Follow-up and Monitoring</p>	<p>A portion of this groundwater is sourced from the recharge zone to the south of the LSMOC. Groundwater collected within the channel would have otherwise discharged to surface within the Buffalo Creek Complex and the wetlands to the north/northwest of the channel. This redirection of groundwater directly to Lake Winnipeg has the potential to impact the water balance for the Buffalo Creek Complex and the surrounding wetlands. The quantitative assessment of baseline water balances was based on conceptual and geochemical modelling, while the quantitative assessment of groundwater discharge to the channel was based on analytical modelling.</p> <p>Previous estimates of groundwater flow into the LSMOC based on analytical modelling were provided in the KGS LSMOC Bedrock Aquifer Depressurization Estimates Memorandum (May 2022). Calculated long-term groundwater inflow rates were on the order of 0.025 cubic metres per second (m³/s) based on this analysis. However, recent field measurements on Reach 3 discussed in IAAC-R2-02 suggest groundwater inflows to the channel can seasonally be an order of magnitude higher, at 0.18 m³/s for Reach 3 alone. Based on these observations, the analytical calculation of groundwater inflow into the channel should be updated to ensure that the annual average calculation of total inflow reflect these seasonally high observed flows. Given the distributed nature of groundwater discharge to surface to the north of the LSMOC it is understood that efforts to quantify this discharge, and to quantify the overall water balance for the system are uncertain. IAAC-R2-02 represents and attempts to quantify these flows using conceptual modelling, and geochemical modelling.</p> <p>Geochemical modelling was completed for Big Buffalo Lake. The results of the modelling suggest that 25% of the total flow to the lake is groundwater (with a range of 5% to 40%) during a wet year. During a dry year, groundwater is a smaller component of the lake water balance, arriving via direct discharge to upstream tributaries to the lake. No further quantification was completed for Buffalo Creek and the associated wetlands downstream of the lake; however, it is suggested that these waterbodies are primarily groundwater fed. This quantification was requested in IAAC-R2-02 because it is these waterbodies that are most proximal to the portion of the channel with the highest groundwater inflow. In the absence of a baseline quantification of the groundwater flow to Buffalo Creek and the associated wetlands (the Buffalo Creek Complex), it is not possible to assess the change in groundwater flow to surface water resulting from the construction and operation of the LSMOC.</p> <p>Effects to Wildlife</p> <p>IAAC-R2-14 documents a decision not to re-water the Buffalo Creek Complex, and the information provided in the response does not include specific assessments for wildlife species. Pathways associated with potential effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat for waterfowl, marsh birds and least bittern, yellow rail, and northern leopard frog require further assessment to support the Agency's drafting of the Environmental Assessment Report.</p> <p>In the response to IAAC-R2-14, the Proponent indicated that the rewatering of Birch Creek and the Buffalo Creek Complex (i.e., Buffalo Creek, Big Buffalo Lake and adjacent wetlands) are no longer being considered due to the potential effects to the systems caused by the spread of AIS (specifically zebra mussel) and related cost concerns to treat water releases. The response states that rewatering is not feasible for either location. As a result, offsetting would be provided for project-related harmful alterations to fish habitat in Birch and Buffalo creeks and for loss of wetlands west of the LSMOC. The response states that post-construction monitoring</p>	<p>e. Describe how loss or alteration of habitat around Birch and Buffalo Creeks due to the Project would be mitigated or offset using a precautionary approach.</p> <p>i. Describe how Indigenous consultation and input would be considered in the decision-making process regarding mitigation or offsetting for Birch Creek and the Buffalo Creek complex.</p> <p>f. Describe the mitigation or offsetting measures for the Buffalo Creek Complex that are being considered to mitigate effects to country foods and furbearers of importance to Indigenous groups.</p> <p>g. Characterize how the change in flow in the Birch Creek and Buffalo Creek Complex systems may affect fish spawning, in terms of the change in flow at the time of spawning and how this could impact spawning success.</p> <p>i. Include information about the historic and current use of the channels by Indigenous groups and others, including fishing, hunting, trapping, and gathering uses of the areas.</p> <p>h. Discuss specific fish habitat offsetting opportunities for the potential reduction in flow to Birch Creek and the Buffalo Creek Complex.</p> <p>i. Describe how Indigenous Knowledge has been used to determine offsetting opportunities.</p>

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
				<p>(Wetland Monitoring Plan, Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plans) will help determine the extent of project-related effects. Given that wetlands enhance water quality by intercepting and filtering surface runoff, and reducing levels of sediments, nutrients and pollutants, the potential for residual effects to water quality resulting from loss of these wetlands should be considered. Based on the response, it is not clear whether the potential effects to water quality from removal of wetland rewatering has been quantified or are just intended to be monitored. To better understand potential effects to migratory birds and species at risk, additional information on mitigations, including offsetting, is required to address loss or alteration of habitat.</p> <p>Changes due to the Project to the Buffalo Lake Complex may have considerable effects on country foods and furbearers of importance to Indigenous groups. While Indigenous groups have not identified specific fishing sites or locations in Buffalo Creek, both the Buffalo Creek Complex and Birch Creek have been readily identified by Indigenous groups as “breadbaskets” for wildlife, and areas central to hunting and trapping practices (e.g., moose, muskrat, beaver, mink, and otter). Effects to forage species may therefore constitute effects to Indigenous Peoples’ current use. The response to IAAC-R2-14 expects the effects to be mitigated by offsetting but does not clarify offsetting options.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments, including changes to key habitat, habitat connectivity and shorelines and riparian areas. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess the modifications of hydrological and hydrometric conditions on fish habitat and the fish species’ life cycle activities, as well as potential effects on riparian areas that take into account any anticipated modifications to fish habitat. The EIS Guidelines also require the Proponent to assess current use, including project-related changes to the quantity, quality and availability of resources used.</p> <p>The recent confirmation by the Proponent that the supplementary flow option to mitigate potential flow losses in Birch Creek and Buffalo Creek is not feasible based on AIS and cost concerns to treat water releases requires a consideration of the potential effects from the reduced flow on fish and fish habitat. The Proponent has provided estimates on flow reduction to these areas and has determined that the reduced flow (approximately 27% and up to 50% reduced flow between Goodison Lake and Lake St. Martin, and 50% reduction to Buffalo Creek flow) will result in a harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (HADD) of fish and fish habitat. However, the absence of comprehensive data and analysis on how this flow reduction may affect existing fish and fish habitat in the creeks makes it challenging to make an informed decision about protection and preservation requirements of species that fall under the <i>Fisheries Act</i>. Adequate knowledge about the habitat and the potential consequences of the flow reduction is required to determine potential residual effects from the project and related offsetting requirements.</p>	
IAAC-R3-03	IAAC-R2-25 EA of LSMOC Temporary Winter	IAAC Interlake Reserves Tribal Council	7.1.5 Fish and fish habitat 7.1.7 Riparian, Wetland and	The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess the Project’s potential cumulative effects on the VCs most likely to be affected by the Project and other projects and activities, including fish and fish habitat, migratory birds, species at risk, surface water and groundwater quality and quantity, and Indigenous Peoples’ current use and rights. The Proponent is required to identify the sources of potential cumulative effects and specify other projects or activities that have	a. Clarify the planned disposition and timing of activities related to the EOC and provide an updated cumulative effects assessment incorporating the current and future condition of the channel and any activities associated with it.

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
	Construction Road	Pinaymootang First Nation Poplar River First Nation Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation	Terrestrial Environments 7.1.8 Migratory birds and their habitat 7.1.9 Species at Risk 7.1.10 Indigenous Peoples 7.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments 7.3.2 Migratory birds 7.3.5 Species at risk 7.4 Mitigation measures 7.6.3 Cumulative effects assessment 9. Follow-up and Monitoring	<p>been or that are likely to be carried out that could cause effects on each selected VC within the boundaries defined, and whose effects would act in combination with the residual effects of the Project. Water management systems and natural and controlled flood events, including flooding that occurred in the Interlakes Region in 2011, are required to be considered as projects or activities that are sources of potential cumulative effects.</p> <p>The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess plant and animal species (abundance, distribution and diversity) and their habitats, with a focus on species at risk or with special status that are of social, economic, cultural or scientific significance. The EIS Guidelines also require the Proponent to describe changes to critical habitat for federally listed species at risk, changes to habitat connectivity, and changes to shorelines and riparian areas. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to identify any potential direct and indirect adverse effects to migratory birds or their habitat, including staging and nesting areas, foraging grounds, and landing sites. The assessment should consider changes to the environment that may affect local movement and seasonal habitat use, any direct habitat loss, the potential for habitat fragmentation, loss of connectivity or other change causing a reduction of habitat quality. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess the potential effects of the Project on federally listed species at risk and their critical habitat, including the direct and indirect effects on the survival or recovery of federally listed species.</p> <p>Emergency Outlet Channel The Proponent states in the response to IAAC-R2-25 that the Emergency Outlet Channel (EOC) has never been considered a component of the Project, however there remains uncertainty in terms of the spatial and temporal boundaries of the EOC components that are considered either a part of the Project scope (for example, portions of Reach 3, and the Temporary Winter Access Road originally built to access Reach 3), or a separate foreseeable future project.</p> <p>The Proponent states that “the final decision on EOC decommissioning and reclamation activities, or other possible outcomes, will depend on input from consultation.” The Proponent expects that follow-up program objectives for the EOC decommissioning and post-construction reclamation of the LSMOC could be coordinated, however there is uncertainty about the reclamation plan or timing, and its cumulative effect on fish and fish habitat, migratory birds, species at risk, surface water and groundwater quality and quantity, and Indigenous Peoples’ current use and rights. While the Proponent notes that decommissioning the EOC is intended to result in a positive change by returning the EOC’s disturbed lands to a natural state, the positive effects pathway is not elaborated or connected to attributes of planned reclamation activities.</p> <p>Temporary Winter Construction Road In the Environmental Assessment of the LSMOC Temporary Winter Construction Road (TWCR), the Proponent states that “while use of the TWCR would result in some very local, long term, but reversible changes to wetland hydrology due to peat compression, and some temporary sensory disturbance to wildlife, the local environment would begin reverting back to pre-Project conditions once use of the road ceased at the end of Year 1 of construction”. Uncertainty remains as to the timing of reclamation activities and mitigations for the fragmentation of wildlife habitat, in connection with the timing of LSMOC construction after Year 1 and during commissioning. The Proponent notes that the TWCR does not cross any reserves or lands identified for Treaty land entitlement and no Crown-leased land parcels are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide timelines and details of how engagement with Indigenous groups and the public will be carried out, and how information gained during engagement may be used to guide decommissioning and reclamation work. b. Provide information about the positive effects pathway associated with reclamation of the EOC, including details of the reclamation plan that support associated effects criteria. c. With respect to the duration and extent of habitat fragmentation within the LSMOC Local Assessment Area (LAA), provide further information about coordination of EOC decommissioning and post-construction reclamation of the LSMOC, including anticipated timing and spatial extent. d. With respect to the duration and extent of habitat fragmentation, and effects to current use and rights within the LSMOC LAA, provide further information about the timing of decommissioning of the TWCR (located to the south of the LSMOC Right of Way [ROW], and aligned with Reach 3 of the EOC), and provide information about decommissioning activities that will be undertaken. e. Provide an updated list of reasonably foreseeable future projects.

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
				<p>crossed by the TWCR, and therefore minimal disruption to the ability to exercise Indigenous rights is anticipated. Uncertainty remains as to the duration of disruption, and the management of access before and during use and reclamation of the TWCR.</p> <p>Clarification of Foreseeable Future Project Timing It is unclear if rehabilitation of Provincial Trunk Highway 6 (PTH 6) and upgrades to the Lake St. Martin access road listed as reasonably foreseeable future projects have been completed as of now, as this information is not readily available from publicly available sources. If those projects are currently completed, they should be noted as past/present physical activities.</p>	
IAAC-R3-04	IAAC-R2-02 IAAC-R2-04 IAAC-R2-13 IAAC-R2-16 IAAC-R2-17	ECCC Fisher River Cree Nation IAAC Interlake Reserves Tribal Council Misipawistik Cree Nation Poplar River First Nation RM of Grahamdale Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation	7.1.7 Riparian, Wetland and Terrestrial Environments 7.1.8 Migratory birds and their habitat 7.1.9 Species at Risk 7.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments 7.3.2 Migratory birds 7.3.5 Species at risk 7.4 Mitigation measures 9. Follow-up and Monitoring Programs	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess plant and animal species (abundance, distribution and diversity) and their habitats, with a focus on species at risk or with special status that are of social, economic, cultural or scientific significance. The EIS Guidelines also require the Proponent to describe changes to critical habitat for federally listed species at risk, changes to habitat connectivity, and changes to shorelines and riparian areas. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to identify any potential direct and indirect adverse effects to migratory birds or their habitat, including staging and nesting areas, foraging grounds, and landing sites. The assessment should consider changes to the environment that may affect local movement and seasonal habitat use, any direct habitat loss, the potential for habitat fragmentation, loss of connectivity or other change causing a reduction of habitat quality. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess the potential effects of the project on federally listed species at risk and their critical habitat, including the direct and indirect effects on the survival or recovery of federally listed species.</p> <p>Wetland Habitat and Offsetting IAAC-R2-02 refers to EIS Section 8.3.6.2 which discusses overall wetland habitat reduction and potential effects to a broad range of wildlife (including waterfowl, marsh birds and Least Bittern, Yellow Rail and Northern Leopard Frog). The Proponent states that water quality monitoring will be coordinated between the Surface Water and Groundwater Management Plans and Aquatic Effects Monitoring Plan and that the Wetland Monitoring Plan will monitor for changes in wetland function in IAAC-R2-04. The Proponent notes that “threshold exceedances will be cause for notification to the wetlands monitoring team for incorporation into their assessment and to inform recommendations made to Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure (MTI) for decision-making”. The Wetland Monitoring Plan discusses monitoring changes in wetland habitat form and function to assess changes to wildlife habitat suitability for species at risk. All wetland-associated species at risk and migratory birds should be included in the Wetland Monitoring Plan, including details on thresholds and associated actions for these species.</p> <p>The response to IAAC-R2-13 states that the Wetland Offsetting Program includes measures taken to enhance, restore or preserve those wetlands that cannot be effectively mitigated and are either: a) defined under the provincial The Water Rights Act as Class III, Class IV and V, or; b) peatlands that are affected by the proposed Project. The proposed Project will directly affect 239 ha of Class III, IV, and V wetlands and 531 ha of peatlands. The Proponent commits to achieving no net loss of Class III wetlands and peatlands and plans to provide offsetting for Class IV and V wetlands.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Quantify Class II wetlands directly affected by the Project. b. Describe how loss of Yellow Rail habitat (Class II wetlands) will be mitigated. c. Update the Wetland Compensation Plan to include offsetting for peatlands, Class II wetlands, and other details provided in the response to IAAC-R2-13. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The offsetting ratios for Class II, III, IV, and V wetlands, as well as peatlands, should be included in an update to the response to IAAC-R2-13, as well as in an updated version of the Wetland Compensation Plan. Taking into consideration the functionality of wetlands where mitigation is not feasible, factor in and document appropriate offsetting ratios to meet the objective of no net loss. d. Quantify habitat suitability and produce habitat maps in the Wetland Monitoring Plan for all wetland-dependent species at risk prior to construction (i.e., similar to Figure IAAC-R2-16-1, Figure IAAC-R2-16-2 and Figure IAAC-R2-16-3 for Northern Leopard Frog). e. Provide mitigation measures to address the effects of habitat fragmentation and physical barriers impacting Northern Leopard Frog. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide information about the feasibility of providing periodic vegetated access points in the rock armouring to improve wildlife passage across the channel. f. Provide a table in the Wetland Monitoring Plan or Wetland Monitoring Report that describes the decision points and benchmarks that will be used to monitor effects to each wetland-dependant species at risk (wildlife and plant species) impacted by the Project (i.e., for each species, what changes in wetland and water quality conditions will signal that adaptive management should be implemented). Include all wetland-dependent species at risk and migratory birds in addition to Least Bittern, Yellow Rail, and Northern Leopard Frog, which are already identified in the Wetland Monitoring Plan. Plant species assessments need to be ecologically relevant to species at risk and migratory bird species already listed who share the same habitat. g. Explain if the revised shoreline near the channel inlets and outlets alters the compensation areas identified for wetland offsetting (Wetland Monitoring Plan, Table 2). If so, revise the Wetland Compensation Plan as needed.

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
				<p>Table IAAC-R2-13-1 'Wetland Dependent Species Anticipated to be Affected by Potential Loss and/or Alteration to Wetlands within the Project Development Area (PDA), and Acts the Species are Protected Under' lists four species at risk that will be impacted by wetland habitat loss/alteration. To better understand potential effects to migratory birds and species at risk, additional information is required including how loss of Class II wetlands habitat for Yellow Rail will be mitigated, and how the Proponent will accomplish no net loss of wetlands.</p> <p>The Proponent indicates that the Wetland Monitoring Plan will be used to determine if mitigation is not feasible for specific wetland sites and if so, offsetting may be considered in these cases. The Proponent states that the selected sites for wetland offsetting will be protected, enhanced, or restored. To better understand potential effects to migratory birds and species at risk, additional information on wetland offsetting ratios is required to achieve the objective of no net loss. It is unclear whether re-watering techniques are considered as a mitigation for the Wetland Offsetting Program. The Agency agrees with Environment and Climate Change Canada's recommendation regarding offsetting Class II wetlands, in addition to Class III, IV, V wetlands and peatlands. When determining appropriate offsetting ratios, functionality of the wetlands in question needs to be factored in and documented.</p> <p>Appendix IAAC-R2-20-1 Wetland Monitoring Report, Table 1-1 'Standards and Benchmarks for Monitoring Parameters' outlines the mechanisms that will trigger adaptive management for wetlands that could be indirectly impacted by the Project. More detail is required for each wetland-dependant species at risk to all assessment of potential effects. The Wetland Monitoring Plan highlights Least Bittern, Yellow Rail, and Northern Leopard Frog as the species at risk most likely to be impacted by the Project. However, detail on thresholds and associated actions for all wetland-associated species at risk and migratory birds is critical to understanding the effectiveness of the Wetland Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>Northern Leopard Frog Habitat</p> <p>The Proponent states in the response to IAAC-R2-16 that the LMOC Project Development Area (PDA) will directly affect some Northern Leopard Frog habitat in the LAA, potentially reducing western movements of Northern Leopard Frog from overwintering sites in the east. The Proponent states that the impact is not significant as all habitats continue to be abundant and contiguous in the landscape. The Proponent does not provide mitigation for habitat fragmentation and the physical barriers during operations that will be caused by the proposed Project. The Proponent has not provided evidence that the smaller armouring material will not impact the ability of Northern Leopard Frog to move across the channel in non-use years.</p> <p>The Proponent states that the effects of extending the inlet and outlet structures will have negligible effects on species at risk and migratory birds. The Proponent concludes the effects of increasing the inlet and outlet structures on habitat availability are localized, low in magnitude, and not significant (i.e., effects are not expected to threaten the viability of a species at risk or migratory bird species in the regional assessment area). The Proponent has determined that there is overwintering habitat for Northern Leopard Frogs near the LMOC inlet and the Agency notes that advice from Environment and Climate Change Canada indicates a potential for snapping turtles to be within the same area. To better understand potential effects to species at risk, additional information is required on how the expansion of the inlet/outlet structures may impact overwintering habitat and how it may alter the compensation area considered for wetland offsetting.</p>	

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
IAAC-R3-05	IAAC-R2-19 IAAC-R2-20	ECCC IAAC Interlake Reserves Tribal Council Pinaymootang First Nation Poplar River First Nation Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation	7.1.7 Riparian, Wetland and Terrestrial Environments 7.1.8 Migratory birds and their habitat 7.1.9 Species at Risk 7.2.3 Changes to riparian, wetland and terrestrial environments 7.3.2 Migratory birds 7.3.5 Species at risk 7.4 Mitigation measures 9. Follow-up and Monitoring	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to describe changes to critical habitat for federally listed species at risk, changes to habitat connectivity, and changes to shorelines and riparian areas. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to identify any potential direct and indirect adverse effects to migratory birds or their habitat, including staging and nesting areas, foraging grounds, and landing sites. The assessment should consider changes to the environment that may affect local movement and seasonal habitat use, any direct habitat loss, the potential for habitat fragmentation, loss of connectivity or other change causing a reduction of habitat quality. The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess the potential effects of the Project on federally listed species at risk and their critical habitat, including the direct and indirect effects on the survival or recovery of federally listed species.</p> <p>Red Headed Woodpecker Mitigation Measures The response to IAAC-R2-19 states that clearing and removal of Red Headed Woodpecker habitat will occur outside of the breeding bird nesting window (Apr 1- Aug 31) in the first year of construction and installation of salvaged decadent trees/nest boxes will be completed 1-2 years after clearing. The Proponent states that information regarding the scheduling of habitat mitigation measures will be included in a revised version of the Red Headed Woodpecker Management Plan. Scheduling of mitigation measures is critical to understanding their effectiveness in mitigating potential significant adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>Habitat Quantification The response to IAAC-R2-20 provides updated information on habitat conditions with species-specific mitigation measures including results from new surveys. However, inconsistencies were noted between the hectares and percentage of habitat loss within the habitat tables and there are outstanding gaps for species-specific mitigation measures.</p> <p>Species-specific Mitigation Measures The Proponent provided a table of species-specific mitigation measures during construction and operation/maintenance (Table IAAC-R2-20-8: Species at Risk, Migratory Birds, and Species of Cultural Importance Mitigation for the Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channels Project), however there are outstanding gaps for species-specific mitigation measures that should be provided in this table. Table IAAC-R2-20-8 'Species at Risk, Migratory Birds, and Species of Cultural Importance Mitigation for the Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channels Project' describes avoidance periods for Project activities. However, mitigation measures during operation of the channels are not provided (i.e., effects to nesting Species at Risk and Migratory Birds if operation occurs during the breeding bird season). The Proponent provided maps with locations of potential breeding, overwintering, and foraging habitat for Northern Leopard Frog (Figures IAAC-R2-16-1, -2, -3). The Proponent's proposed mitigation is to exclude frogs from entering overwintering areas using exclusion fencing (Table IAAC-R2-20-8). As the Proponent has determined that there is overwintering habitat for Northern Leopard Frog near the LMOC inlet, there then is potential for snapping turtles to be within the same area. Snapping turtles also have vulnerability to winter disturbance, as well as nesting habitat. Mitigation measures to avoid or lessen the effects of the Project to snapping turtles and their habitat have not been provided. To better understand potential effects to species at risk, migratory birds and species of cultural importance, additional information on species-specific</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Revise the Red Headed Woodpecker Management Plan with the schedule for habitat mitigation measures. b. Verify and revise that areas of habitat and loss of habitat percentages are accurate and consistent throughout the habitat tables provided in IAAC-R2-20. c. Provide additional information on species-specific mitigation measures in Table IAAC-R2-20-8, particularly during operations and maintenance, including, but not limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Barn Swallow – detail measures that will be used during construction to mitigate risk of nesting on equipment or infrastructure. ii. Bank Swallow – include mitigation for aggregate piles/quarries both during construction and operation/maintenance. iii. Common Nighthawk - detail measures that will be used to avoid risk associated with the Common Nighthawk's propensity to nest on roadways or gravel trails. iv. Least Bittern – detail how loss of habitat will be mitigated. Detail measures that will be used to avoid risk of nests being flooded when channel is in operation. v. Yellow Rail – detail how loss of class II wetland habitat will be mitigated. vi. Snapping Turtle – provide mitigation measures to avoid and lessen the effect of disturbance to snapping turtles including nesting habitat and nests. Detail how disturbance of overwintering habitat (and effects to overwintering turtles) during winter construction will be mitigated. vii. Short-eared owl – detail measures that will be used to avoid or mitigate against nest disturbance or destruction due to mowing or other maintenance activities. viii. Eastern Whip-poor-will (EWPW) - include mowing and clearing date restrictions during maintenance and operations as per EWPW Management Plan. Add additional details and mitigations for when operations begin after the breeding bird season has begun. ix. Add mowing and clearing date restrictions to the Operation and Maintenance column for additional species including but not limited to Golden-winged warbler, Bobolink and Least Bittern. x. Cross reference and identify any species listed in Schedule 1 of the Migratory Bird Regulations 2022 that have been identified as having year-round nest protection that may be impacted by the proposed Project.

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
				<p>mitigation measures to avoid, lessen and monitor effects to species at risk and migratory birds should be provided.</p> <p>In Tables IAAC-R2-20 2 and IAAC-R2-20 3, the Proponent has quantified habitat types that have the potential to support migratory birds during the breeding season, while habitat for species at risk and culturally important species have been quantified for the PDA and LAA in Tables IAAC-R2-20-4 and 5.</p> <p>A Northern Leopard Frog survey was completed in 2022, however the Proponent stated that the survey was conducted under conditions that were not ideal due to significant flooding and wet spring conditions. Additionally, the autonomic recording units (ARUs) that were set up at wetland monitoring sites had not been analyzed at the time the report was written (Appendix IAAC-R2-20-2: 2022 WSP Northern Leopard Frog Survey).</p> <p>The Proponent notes that pre-construction surveys for species at risk were conducted in 2022. Eastern Whip-Poor-Will (EWPW) have been detected within critical habitat as identified in the <i>Species at Risk Act</i> (SARA) Recovery Strategy both within the LSMOC PDA and LAA. It is not clear if the EWPW Management Plan, submitted in June 2022, has been updated based on the results of the 2022 species at risk surveys. Appendix IAAC-R2-20-1: 2022 WSP Wetland Monitoring Report states that, despite ARU malfunctions, data collected in 2022 was sufficient for baseline characterization but not sufficient for the detailed comparisons required to inform if observed changes are attributable to the project. The 2022 WSP Wetland Monitoring Report states that supplemental baseline data collection in 2023 would provide a more robust data set for future monitoring purposes.</p> <p>Table IAAC-R2-20-3 'Wetland Cover Types in the Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channel Wildlife Local Assessment Area' does not use the Stewart and Kantrud wetland classification regime that was used throughout the rest of the EIS. In order to better understand potential effects to migratory birds, species at risk, and wetlands from the Project, additional information and clarifications on the surveys completed is required and additional baseline studies may need to be conducted due to the poor weather conditions and equipment malfunctions experienced during the previous survey periods.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> xi. Include wetland offsetting mitigation for wetland dependent species such as Least Bittern, Yellow Rail, Northern Leopard Frog etc. xii. In Table IAAC-R2-20-8, in the first row 'American badger' under the 'Operations and Maintenance' column, the term nests should be updated to dens. The column currently reads 'buffers/setbacks will be applied to active nests'. d. Provide detail regarding how effects to nesting species at risk and migratory birds will be mitigated if operation of the channels is initiated after the breeding bird nesting season has started. e. Include mitigations for effects due to mowing and clearing activities for each species affected during operation and maintenance. f. Revise and update appropriate Environmental Management Plans with the revised mitigation table to ensure all of the necessary mitigations for migratory birds and species at risk are included. g. Detail mitigation measures that will be in place to protect migratory bird nesting islands in Lake St. Martin and Lake Winnipeg from flooding during operation of the channels. h. Revise Table IAAC-R2-20-3 so that the Wetland Cover Class column uses the same classification system (Stewart and Kantrud) as is used throughout the EIS and include Class II wetlands in the table. i. Confirm if additional baseline data is being collected in 2023 for the Wetland Monitoring Plan. If additional baseline is being collected, provide a plan for incorporation of this data into the Wetland Monitoring Plan and providing the updated plan to the Agency and relevant authorities. j. Clarify how the detection of multiple EWPW in the LSMOC and within EWPW critical habitat affects the EWPW Habitat Management Plan. k. Confirm if the area of critical habitat that overlaps the PDA contains the biophysical attributes required by EWPW. If so, detail the plan to mitigate effects to EWPW critical habitat in the project area. l. Revise the EWPW Habitat Management Plan as needed based on the detection of EWPW in the LSMOC PDA. m. Include a description to accompany Table IAAC-R2-20-5 that describes which habitat types are included as 'habitat' for each species listed in the table.
IAAC-R3-06	IAAC-R2-14 IAAC-R2-15 IAAC-R2-17 IAAC-R2-24 IAAC-R2-27 IAAC-R2-29 IAAC-R2-34	Berens River First Nation Bloodvein First Nation Dakota Tipi First Nation ECCC	7.1.10 Indigenous Peoples 7.3.3 Indigenous Peoples 9. Monitoring and Follow up Programs	<p>The EIS Guidelines require the Proponent to assess effects to Indigenous Peoples' current use, physical and cultural heritage, and health and socio-economic conditions. The Project overlaps with the traditional territories of many First Nations and Métis locals in the Interlakes region and surrounding waterbodies affected by the Project, and thus may modify their ability to undertake current use practices, affect resources and sites of importance, and affect their health and socio-economic conditions.</p> <p>Surface Water Quality The response to IAAC-R2-14 indicates the residual effects of Project operation on surface water quality are not anticipated to pose a threat to the long-term persistence and viability of traditionally harvested fish or wildlife species in the RAA. Fisher River Cree Nation noted that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discuss the effects of changes to surface water quality on traditionally harvested fish and wildlife species in the LAA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Provide an overview of effects to each main waterbody/watercourse and analyze the associated effects to the resources that support current use. ii. Assess associated effects to Indigenous Peoples' health and socio-economic conditions, including recreational enjoyment and use of lands. b. Reassess effects to current use arising from the fragmentation of the landscape as a result of project infrastructure.

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
		Fisher River Cree Nation IAAC Interlake Reserves Tribal Council Little Saskatchewan First Nation Misipawistik Cree Nation Peguis First Nation Pinaymootang First Nation Poplar River First Nation RM of Grahamdale Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation		<p>the RAA is a large area, much of which may be difficult to access or a far distance from a local traditional hunting or fishing location. Understanding specific effects to water quality in more localized areas is important to understand the overall effects to the availability and quality of resources for current use. The IRTC, Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation, Pinaymootang First Nation, and Sagkeeng First Nation noted the lack of consideration of how increased sediments will affect other facets of their socio-economic conditions, such as recreational enjoyment and use of lands.</p> <p>Fragmentation of the Landscape The Project has the potential to modify access to traditional resources and areas of current use through restrictions on the ability to navigate to and through areas used for traditional purposes. The response to IAAC-R2-15 asserts that patterns of access outside the PDA will not be altered, thus effects to traditional use will be minimal. The Proponent noted that Indigenous harvesters will be able to continue to travel in the area but the need to cross outlet channels at designated locations will impose some restrictions on travel. However, the Interlake Reserves Tribal Council (IRTC), Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation, Pinaymootang First Nation, and Sagkeeng First Nation identified that the channels would create nearly impassable obstacles for their members to travel by foot or quad. The inability to access and traverse large portions of land represents a direct restriction on the ability of Indigenous groups to exercise their rights.</p> <p>The IRTC, Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation, Pinaymootang First Nation, and Sagkeeng First Nation also raised concerns about the physical components of the channel affecting wildlife movement and mortality. They noted that the assessment of effects to wildlife travel across the channel fails to take into consideration the cleared 400 metre ROW on either side of the channel, as well as water velocities within the channel during operation. In response to IAAC-R2-17, the Proponent states that spoil piles present along the length of the channel ROW will be configured to guide wildlife to locations that are safer and easier to cross (i.e., where smaller rock size will be used for armouring the channels). The Proponent does not offer additional mitigation measures to address the effects of the Project on wildlife movement. The Proponent notes that for both LSMOC and LMOC, high flows during operation are anticipated to impede wildlife movement by deterring wildlife from entering the channels. Additional information on configuration of the spoil piles which guide wildlife or any other mitigation measures is required to understand potential effects to wildlife movement.</p> <p>In response to IAAC-R2-21, the Proponent commits to restricting access along the channels through signage, fencing, limiting road access, and having conservation officers patrol the channels. However, Fisher River Cree Nation noted that enforcing access restrictions along 46 km of outlet channels through the life of the Project would be difficult. The effectiveness of the enforcing access restrictions as a mitigation measure is uncertain.</p> <p>Indigenous Participation The response to IAAC-R2-30 discusses the Proponent's proposed Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) as a means of continued engagement with Indigenous groups. Indigenous groups continue to raise concerns regarding the structure and function of the EAC, including access to information, input into decision-making, and Indigenous participation and capacity support. The Proponent indicated that the EAC is intended to support the meaningful participation of local communities in environmental monitoring for the proposed Project, promote the inclusion of local and Indigenous Knowledge in the Environmental Monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Include the consideration of barriers to wildlife access, as well as the implications arising from travel barriers to Indigenous land users. Include a discussion on effects to specifically identified sites and areas in the PDA. ii. Include an assessment of effects to wildlife arising from increased predation along the cleared ROW on either side of the outlet channels and from increased water velocities in the channel during operations. iii. Include details on the outlet channel crossings, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Location and distance in between crossings ii. What type of travel these crossings will be able to accommodate (foot, quad, etc.) iii. Signage for crossings iv. Provide clarity on the configuration of the spoil piles that will be present along the length of the channel ROWs and how they will be configured to guide wildlife to locations that are safer and easier to cross. A diagram and/or more details to better explain the concept is suggested. Details could include but are not limited to dimensions, slope, location, duration, etc. of the spoil piles and locations of the safe crossings. v. Consider and describe additional ways to enforce access restrictions along both channels. Discuss feasibility of hiring a dedicated security personnel to enforce access restrictions. vi. Discuss the option of registering the Lake St. Martin Access Road, temporary access road, and the service road along the channels as 'Resource Roads' on Manitoba's Crown Lands Registry. vii. Include any additional mitigations for effects to access for current use purposes. c. Discuss Indigenous groups' involvement in the development of mitigation measures and implementation of monitoring and reporting activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Include a table that describes the opportunities for the involvement of Indigenous groups in the development and facilitation of each type of monitoring and reporting activity, including timelines for such involvement. ii. Describe how specific training and any equipment will be provided to Indigenous groups to support their participation in monitoring efforts. iii. Describe how capacity for Indigenous groups to participate in monitoring programs and the EAC will be provided. iv. Describe the process that will be taken to implement recommendations put forward by the EAC and commitments to implementing these recommendations. v. Discuss the intersection between nation-specific consultation and the EAC. Describe how input from consultation with Indigenous groups will be taken into account within the EAC.

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
				<p>Plans, and provide a direct point of contact for the Proponent to local communities. It is critical to ensure Indigenous groups have a full understanding of what this entails and the associated support (e.g. training, equipment, and capacity) that will be provided to ensure meaningful participation in these aspects and programs moving forward. Indigenous groups have noted that they must be included in the monitoring activity, reporting, and solutions or mitigation at every step and have adequate training and equipment to do so. Berens River First Nation, Peguis First Nation, and Fisher River Cree Nation indicated that local fishers have experienced sediment build-up in fishing areas and identified the need for additional information regarding how monitoring capacity and equipment required will be provided to support Indigenous participation in the Aquatic Environmental Monitoring Plan. Dakota Tipi First Nation, Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation, Pinaymootang First Nation, and Sagkeeng First Nation identified the need for the co-development of a program to monitor increased sediment build-up in traditional fishing areas.</p> <p>Heritage Resources The response to IAAC-R2-34 presents conflicting information with regards to heritage resources, the approval of the Heritage Resource Impact Assessment (HRIA) by the Heritage Resources Board for the proposed Project (WSP [2020]), and the distance of the Fairford Trail from Lake Manitoba. The response also refers to mapbooks in the Environmental Protection Plan that contain "site-specific detailed protection measures" that are not provided.</p> <p>The Interlake Reserves Tribal Council, Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation, Pinaymootang First Nation, and Sagkeeng First Nation identified concerns with the Heritage Resource Protection Plan, including the lack of involvement of Indigenous groups in its development, need for cultural protocols on lands affected by the proposed Project, excavation of resources, and lack of Indigenous involvement in chance find procedures. Protecting a regionally significant and complex settlement site that dates back to 3000 B.P., has been identified as a top priority by Indigenous groups. Poplar River First Nation expressed concern regarding the lack of baseline data on cultural heritage as a result of the lack of funding for field work with elders and knowledge carriers regarding sites and artifacts. Dakota Tipi First Nation noted concerns about the lack of measures or actions to protect identified cultural, ceremonial, and harvesting sites.</p>	<p>d. Update the Heritage Resource Protection Plan to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mapbooks that include site-specific mitigation measures. ii. A description of the protection measures provided in the HRIA for heritage resources. iii. A description of how the Indigenous Knowledge provided was used to determine effects to all tangible and intangible cultural heritage resources. Provide examples of specific Indigenous Knowledge regarding intangible cultural heritage resources and describe how this information was incorporated into the assessment. iv. Acknowledgement and discussion of the concerns raised about the loss of a regionally significant cultural settlement site (dating back to 3000 B.P.). Include this site in the assessment of potential effects to sites of importance and Indigenous peoples' physical and cultural heritage. v. A description of the heritage resource sites (that the Proponent is aware of) that will be lost due to excavation and the specific mitigations identified for the loss of these sites. vi. A summary of key mitigations for the avoidance and protection of identified cultural, ceremonial, and harvesting sites. vii. A description of Indigenous involvement in any archaeological work and chance find procedures.