

## Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin Outlet Channels Project – Supplemental Information Requests Round 3

### List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym or Abbreviation	Definition
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FRCN	Fisher River Cree Nation
IMP	Ice Management Plan
IAAC	Impact Assessment Agency of Canada
IRTC	Interlake Reserves Tribal Council
LSFN	Little Saskatchewan First Nation
RAA	Regional Assessment Area

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

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
IAAC-R3-07	IAAC-R2-29	<p>Dauphin River First Nation</p> <p>Fisher River Cree Nation</p> <p>IAAC</p> <p>Interlake Reserves Tribal Council</p> <p>Kinonjeoshtegon First Nation</p> <p>Lake Manitoba First Nation</p> <p>Lake St. Martin First Nation</p> <p>Little Saskatchewan First Nation</p> <p>Peguis First Nation</p> <p>Pinaymootang First Nation</p> <p>Poplar River First Nation</p> <p>Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation</p> <p>Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation</p>	<p>7.1.10 Indigenous Peoples</p> <p>7.3.3 Indigenous Peoples</p>	<p>Multiple Indigenous groups conducted Rights Impact Assessments and Socio-Economic Wellbeing Studies to document potential project impacts on their rights, wellbeing, and way of life.</p> <p>In response to IAAC-R2-29, the Proponent provided Table IAAC-R2-29-1 that summarizes available information for each Indigenous group regarding current and future availability of country foods; water quality (drinking, recreational and cultural uses); mental and social well-being; economic conditions; use of navigable waters; food security; and other topics such as health care systems, cultural continuity, employment, increased population, cost of living, transportation delays, or other factors where they were brought forward by Indigenous groups. This table presents new information that supports the understanding of how the Project impacts rights including through an understanding of the effects to the biological and physical conditions that support the exercise of rights. Fisher River Cree Nation (FRCN) indicated that Table IAAC-R2-29-1 is of unreasonable size for review, and requested a summary analysis with examples of key issues and unique issues raised by Indigenous groups. A summary would also support IAAC and federal authorities' analysis of the information provided.</p> <p>FRCN noted that their specific Aboriginal and Treaty Rights have not been identified or discussed by the Proponent. As a result, the potential impacts of the Project on FRCN's specific uses and occupations of lands and resources have not been adequately assessed. FRCN noted that they are a Treaty 5 First Nation with roots in Norway House and York Factory, and therefore may have different Aboriginal and Treaty rights than the Treaty 2 First Nations located within the Project's Regional Assessment Area (RAA). For example, Game Hunting Areas 21 and 21A which surround FRCN are closed to all moose hunting. For FRCN members who have relied on moose for meat and cultural uses, the loss of habitat which may further delay the recovery of the moose population is an important potential cumulative impact. This potential impact may be different for other Indigenous groups if they have the opportunity to hunt moose in other areas. This is one example of how priorities and potential impacts on rights may differ between communities.</p> <p>Little Saskatchewan First Nation (LSFN) indicated that the Rights Impact Assessments and Socio-Economic Wellbeing Studies serve as a concrete articulation of their Indigenous Knowledge which must be meaningfully included in the assessments of the potential effects of the Project. LSFN noted that the Proponent referenced these studies in their Round 2 IR responses; however, these references do not indicate meaningful consideration of concerns or integration of the referenced information into the planning and design of the Project.</p> <p>The Interlake Reserves Tribal Council, Sandy Bay Ojibway First Nation, Pinaymootang First Nation, and Sagkeeng Anicinabe First Nation further noted that the Proponent has not indicated how engagement data has informed changes or revisions to the information provided, or how the Proponent has ensured the meaningful integration of Indigenous perspectives into project processes and documentation.</p> <p>The Interlake Reserves Tribal Council (IRTC) raised concerns about the lack of mitigations for effects to cultural continuity. They noted that the overarching socio-economic status and</p>	<p>a. Discuss any distinctions between the Aboriginal and Treaty rights of all Indigenous groups engaged on the Project.</p> <p>b. Update the assessment of impacts on the rights of each Indigenous group engaged on the Project, using the information in the Rights Impact Assessments, Socio-Economic Wellbeing Studies, and comments provided in response to Round 2 Information Requests.</p> <p>c. Indicate how all Indigenous input and knowledge collected during engagement processes has informed or influenced changes and revisions to project documentation such as Environmental Management Plans and information request responses.</p> <p>d. Describe how Indigenous input and knowledge has been incorporated into mitigation and adaptive management measures, providing specific examples for each Indigenous group.</p> <p>e. Provide a summary analysis of Table R2-29-1, including specific examples of key issues for each Indigenous group, and an assessment of common and unique issues raised by Indigenous groups.</p> <p>f. Discuss Project potential effects to cultural continuity, including knowledge transmission, sense of place, and cultural identity, and provide mitigation, monitoring, and follow-up measures related to these effects.</p> <p>g. Discuss Project potential effects to ice fishing and provide mitigation, monitoring, and follow-up measures related to these effects.</p>

IR#	Referenced Round 2 IR(s)	Expert Dept. or group	EIS Guideline Reference	Context and Rationale	Information Request
				<p>wellbeing of the IRTC member Nations will be affected by the reductions in the availability of culturally important foods and medicines, fish, and wildlife species, loss of access to preferred harvesting areas, and the resulting impacts to knowledge transmission, sense of place, and cultural identity. The Rights Impact Assessments echo this concern and note that the connection to the land and cultural continuity is an integral element of Indigenous groups' way of life.</p> <p>Rights Impact Assessments provided by Indigenous groups discuss changes to the ability to safely access preferred fishing areas and efficacy of fishing due to project-related changes in water flow currents that affect ice-depth patterns. Lake St. Martin First Nation identified priority ice fishing times to be during first and last ice in the fall and spring, respectively. The IRTC, Peguis First Nation, Pinaymootang First Nation, and Poplar River First Nation raised concerns about the ability to ice fish due to alterations to water levels resulting in shallow waters during the winter, changes to water freeze levels/ice formation, effects to gill fish nets, and increased danger of ice fishing. Discussions related to ice management are currently focused on ice conditions and jamming within the channels and do not provide discussion of changes to ice conditions related to ice fishing. The Agency understands that the Proponent has provided an ice management plan (IMP); it is important to understand the intersection of the IMP with winter operation of the outlet channels and impacts to Indigenous groups' fishing rights.</p>	