



PO Box 7950 Stn Main • Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada • R3C 0J1  
(204) 360-4394 • sjohnson@hydro.mb.ca

---

February 19, 2013

Ms. Elise Dagdick  
Environmental Assessment and Licensing Branch  
Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship  
Suite 160, 123 Main St., Winnipeg, MB  
R3C 1A5

Ms. Dagdick

**RE: Bipole III Transmission Project – Follow-up Public EIS review and TAC comments**

Please find enclosed responses to the follow-up Public EIS review and TAC comments, which were received by Manitoba Hydro on August 27, 2012.

We trust the enclosed responds appropriately to your request. Should you have any questions or require further clarification of our comments please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

*Original Signed by Shannon Johnson*

Shannon Johnson  
Manager Licensing and Environmental Assessment Department  
820 Taylor Ave (3)  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3M 3T1

sj/lt

Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship

Bipole III Transmission Project

Follow-up Public Review and TAC Comments

MCWS/MH-TAC-II

February 2013

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-001a

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify what, if any information obtained from First Nations or Metis support the  
 3 modelling conclusions reached for the intact forested peat lands complex in the  
 4 Mafeking area is not high quality habitat for moose?

5 Please clarify what, if any information obtained from First Nations or Metis assist in the  
 6 description of moose habitat for the Mafeking area; specifically information collected via  
 7 ATK Workshop questions Forestry, #5 1-66 or Mammals #120-142, Appendix #5,  
 8 Traditional Knowledge Technical Report # 1, or Independent ATK Studies?

9 **Response:**

10 Information obtained from First Nations and Metis identified broad areas used for  
 11 hunting which would have included intact forested peat lands as well as high quality  
 12 forage abundant habitat. Information provided through maps and interviews derived  
 13 from the ATK workshops and reports support the model assumptions that good moose  
 14 areas contain young mixed-wood forests, willows and tall shrubs. This information was  
 15 incorporated into the EIS to support conclusions on residual effects. Moose model  
 16 parameters are based on literature describing high quality moose habitat that provides  
 17 adequate forage for wintering moose and includes all tall shrubs in the Mid-boreal  
 18 Upland and Aspen Parkland Ecoregions as well as all forest stands and tall shrubs  
 19 between 10 and 60 years of age for the rest of the Project Study Area as described in  
 20 the Land Cover Classification Enhanced for Bipole (LCCEB). The intact forest peat lands  
 21 in the Mafeking area were not identified specifically as high quality habitat under these  
 22 model assumptions.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-001b1

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify what if any information obtained from First Nations or Metis support the  
 3 balance reached for routing selection through the known wintering area of the  
 4 Wabowden boreal woodland caribou herd?

5 Did the land use conflicts cited in this Response include information received from First  
 6 Nations or Metis about Aboriginal use of land for traditional purposes (i.e, domestic use  
 7 of resources for subsistence purposes)?

8 **Response:**

9 No specific information was provided to Manitoba Hydro regarding traditional use of  
 10 boreal woodland caribou in the Wabowden area. Manitoba Hydro has developed a route  
 11 adjustment in the Wabowden Evaluation Range, which is intended to further reduce  
 12 potential impacts to boreal woodland caribou as a result of land use conflicts.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-001b2

1 **Question:**

2 Please describe how any future consultations with First Nations or Metis would be  
3 executed by Manitoba Hydro in the event of a routing change?

4 **Response:**

5 Sections of the Final Preferred Route for the Bipole III Transmission Project are being  
6 considered for adjustment in three areas. Manitoba Hydro sent letters to First Nations,  
7 the Manitoba Metis Federation, and other communities along the Final Preferred Route.  
8 All letters provided an opportunity to meet with Manitoba Hydro if there was interest to  
9 discuss the route adjustments.

10 Manitoba Hydro held both regional open houses and community open houses to share  
11 information and receive feedback on the routing adjustments. Community open houses  
12 were organized and held in conjunction with interested communities. Manitoba Hydro  
13 will continue to endeavour to engage with the MMF to share information and address  
14 concerns related to these route adjustments. The routing revisions occur in areas where  
15 Traditional and local knowledge has already been shared with Manitoba Hydro in the  
16 Bipole III context. Manitoba Hydro re-examined this information in light of the proposed  
17 changes.

18 Manitoba Hydro also expects that feedback on the route adjustments will be received  
19 through the CEC process.

20 Manitoba Hydro will continue to review the draft EnvPP with communities who have  
21 expressed concerns to identify how concerns will be addressed and to ensure ESS are  
22 identified and addressed within the ENVPP.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002a

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify how information from First Nations or Metis will inform the identification  
3 of environmentally sensitive sites in the field by Manitoba Hydro field personnel?

4 Please clarify how that information will be obtained from First Nations and Metis,  
5 including specific timelines for its collection.

6 **Response:**

7 Sensitive sites identified through ATK workshops and self directed studies will need to be  
8 validated for spatial accuracy as they were delineated at a large scale. Community  
9 meetings are being held to present the Environmental Protection Plan and document any  
10 new sensitive sites identified by the community.

11 Manitoba Hydro is working with First Nations, NACCs and the Manitoba Metis Federation  
12 to further refine sensitive site locations in Northern Manitoba for Construction EnvPPs  
13 (CEnvPP) for Project infrastructure north of The Pas as this is potentially where  
14 construction is scheduled to start in 2013. Central and southern sections of the Project  
15 will have sites validated in 2013 through 2014 as CEnvPPs are developed according to  
16 construction schedules.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002c

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify what if any information was collected from First Nations or Metis related  
3 to wolverine denning sites in the Bipole Study Area; specifically information collected via  
4 ATK Workshop questions Mammals, # 120-142, Appendix #5, Traditional Knowledge  
5 Technical Report # 1, or Independent A TK Studies?

6 **Response:**

7 ATK gathered in interviews or reports did not yield any information related to wolverine  
8 denning sites. The only information gathered through ATK in interviews related to  
9 wolverine is that there is active trapping in the Moondance Creek area near Gillam.



<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002d

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify, what if any information was obtained from First Nations or Metis  
3 regarding the Cape Churchill coastal herd populations; specifically, what information  
4 collected via ATK Workshop questions Mammals, #120-142, Appendix #5, Traditional  
5 Knowledge Technical Report # I, or Independent ATK Studies?

6 Please identify, what if any quantitative information was obtained from First Nations or  
7 Metis regarding harvesting of caribou in this area to support conclusions reached?

8 **Response:**

9 No specific quantitative information was provided regarding the Cape Churchill coastal  
10 herd population from ATK workshops or reports. ATK reports and interviews from First  
11 Nations and Metis indicate caribou are hunted in the Gillam area. Fox Lake Cree Nation  
12 indicates that the migratory woodland ecotype and other caribou (Barren Ground and  
13 Pen Island) occur in the area and are hunted (Keewatinoow Converter Station & BiPole  
14 III Aski Keskentamowin Report, 2011). Interviewees from Fox Lake Cree Nation indicate  
15 that the Pen Island and Barren Ground caribou migrate through the area and will mix  
16 together in the late fall and early winter.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002e

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify what if any information was collected directly from First Nation or Metis  
3 by Manitoba Hydro that support conclusions reached for Coastal Caribou? Specifically, is  
4 this information captured as "anecdotal information" cited in this response?

5 Please identify if any quantitative information was captured from First Nation or Metis  
6 via ATK Workshop questions Mammals, # 120-142, Appendix #5, Traditional Knowledge  
7 Technical Report #1 or Independent ATK Studies?

8 **Response:**

9 Data from telemetry studies and estimated population levels from Manitoba  
10 Conservation and Water Stewardship (MCWS) and Parks Canada in combination with  
11 ATK information provide the basis for the conclusions reached in the EIS regarding Cape  
12 Churchill caribou. The "anecdotal information" was in reference to information known to  
13 MCWS and provides some historical context for the Cape Churchill caribou. This  
14 anecdotal information is not critical to the conclusions of the EIS on Cape Churchill  
15 caribou.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002i

1 **Question:**

2 What if any information was collected directly from First Nations or Metis to support the  
 3 conclusions reached by the modelling exercise conducted for the identification of  
 4 marten, caribou, moose and beaver habitat? Specifically, was information collected via  
 5 ATK Workshop questions Mammals, #120-142, Appendix #5, Traditional Knowledge  
 6 Technical Report #1 used by wildlife disciplines (as described in methodology Section  
 7 3.2 Traditional Knowledge Technical Report #1)?

8 **Response:**

9 ATK information from workshops and reports generally provided information on locations  
 10 of hunting, trapping and gathering. General information from ATK workshops and  
 11 reports on habitats associated with VEC mammals was limited. However, where  
 12 available, this information supported the assumptions and predictions of high quality  
 13 habitat models. Boreal woodland caribou models were based on habitat use data from  
 14 telemetry studies and are described in the *Bipole III Supplemental Caribou Technical*  
 15 *Report*.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002j

1 **Question:**

2 The consent form (Appendix 6, Traditional Knowledge Technical Report #1) used by  
 3 Manitoba Hydro clearly states collected information would be used for the Environmental  
 4 Assessment process. The consent form docs not state that information (including spatial  
 5 information) would not be available for review. Please provide evidence that  
 6 interviewees (or their leadership) understood Manitoba Hydro would not share  
 7 information collected, particularly when that information would be requested by the  
 8 Crown for the purposes of the environmental assessment.

9 If Hydro will not provide information to the Crown for review, please confirm that ATK  
 10 information (including consent forms, transcripts and/or recordings, spatial data,  
 11 including original mark up maps) will be provided to each First Nation and Metis group  
 12 leadership in a timely fashion (as described in the methodology section 3.4 or this  
 13 Report) for their review.

14 Confirm which First Nations and Metis provided spat ial data for use in constraints  
 15 mapping used in the SSEA (Chapter 7, Appendix 7A); also, please confirm which First  
 16 Nations or Metis prohibited Manitoba Hydro from using spatial data in constraints  
 17 mapping.

18 Please clarify further why obtaining consent would be difficult if Manitoba Hydro has  
 19 access to the recording list of participants as described in the Consent Form, Appendix 6  
 20 Traditional Knowledge Technical Report # 1?

21 **Response:**

22       **1)** Please provide evidence that interviewees (or their leadership) understood  
23           Manitoba Hydro would not share information collected, particularly when that  
24           information would be requested by the Crown for the purposes of the  
25           environmental assessment.

26   Please see Appendix 4, page 113 ATK Report #1 for the Agenda and Appendix 6, page  
27   123 ATK Report #1 for the terms of the consent form. Appendix 11, pages 141-142  
28   provides the PowerPoint presentation that was given at the outset of the introductory  
29   meeting in all communities. The potential interviewees were informed during the  
30   introductory meeting presentation that anything that they shared with the study team  
31   was considered to be their intellectual property and was to be treated as confidential.  
32   Certain individuals wanted a guarantee that their knowledge would not be made public  
33   and so chose anonymity.

34       **2)** If Hydro will not provide information to the Crown for review, please confirm that  
35           ATK information (including consent forms, transcripts and/or recordings, spatial  
36           data, including original mark up maps) will be provided to each First Nation and  
37           Metis group leadership in a timely fashion (as described in the methodology  
38           section 3.4 or this Report) for their review.

39   For the Bipole III Project ATK Study, CD copies of interviews were returned to the  
40   interviewee along with transcription and copy of memory map for verification.  
41   Knowledge shared at the ATK workshops was sent to the community for verification and  
42   for their records. Please see the table below regarding the ATK workshop date and the  
43   date the ATK information was provided to each First Nation and NACC community.

44

Community	Workshop Date	Date Review Package Sent
Camperville	October 6-7, 2009	July 28, 2010
Waywayseecappo First Nation	November 25-26, 2010	July 28, 2010
Herb Lake Landing	December 8-9, 2009	July 28, 2010
Dawson Bay	February 9-10, 2010	July 28, 2010
Barrows	February 18-19, 2010	September 23, 2010
Pelican Rapids	March 15-16, 2010	December 20, 2010
Pine Creek First Nation	March 25-26, 2010	July 28, 2010
Cormorant	March 30-31, 2010	November 19, 2010
Pikwitonei	May 17-18, 2010	December 21, 2010
Chemawawin Cree Nation/Easterville	June 8-9, 2010	March 8, 2011
Thicket Portage	June 16-17, 2010	March 8, 2011
Westgate	June 24-25, 2010	March 8, 2011
National Mills	June 24-25, 2010	March 8, 2011
Powell	June 24-25, 2010	March 8, 2011
Baden	June 24-25, 2010	March 8, 2011
Red Deer Lake	June 24-25, 2010	March 8, 2011
Duck Bay	September 16-17, 2010	January 5, 2011
Dakota Plains Wahpeton First Nation	November 16-17, 2010	March 8, 2011
Dakota Tipi First Nation	November 23-24, 2010	March 8, 2011

45

46 **3)** Confirm which First Nations and Metis provided spatial data for use in constraints  
 47 mapping used in the SSEA (Chapter 7, Appendix 7A); also, please confirm which  
 48 First Nations or Metis prohibited Manitoba Hydro from using spatial data in  
 49 constraints mapping.

50 Table 5, entitled ATK Regions Identified for Analysis Purpose on page 30 of the  
 51 Bipole III ATK Report #1 identifies the First Nations and NACC communities that  
 52 provided spatial data for use in constraints mapping used in the SSEA. Also, please  
 53 see the list of ESS sites in Appendix 12, Bipole III ATK ESS Tables, Bipole III ATK  
 54 Report #1, which lists points, lines and polygons that were identified during the ATK  
 55 Workshop process.

56 For communities that participated in the Bipole III ATK Study, none of the First  
57 Nations or NACC prohibited Manitoba Hydro from using spatial data in constraints  
58 mapping. The consent forms (please see Appendix 6 of the Bipole III ATK Report  
59 #1) indicate the use of the ATK for the purpose of the Environmental Assessment  
60 process.

61 **4)** Please clarify further why obtaining consent would be difficult if Manitoba Hydro  
62 has access to the recording list of participants as described in the Consent Form,  
63 Appendix 6 Traditional Knowledge Technical Report # 1?

64 The consent form located in Appendix 6 p. 123 Traditional Knowledge Technical Report  
65 # 1 represents the document signed by the interviewer and interviewee agreeing to the  
66 terms of the interview. The forms were intended to allow for the participant to share  
67 information for the environmental assessment process for the Bipole III Transmission  
68 Project while protecting the interviewee from misuse of the person's recorded interview.  
69 The forms did not mention sharing information with third parties. The only means for  
70 acquiring the individual interview transcripts and maps is through the consent of the  
71 individual who was interviewed. In the case of those who requested anonymity, no  
72 personal identification will be provided. Obtaining consent would be difficult, as mailing  
73 addresses were only collected from individuals who requested a copy of their transcript.  
74 Since the workshops took place in 2009 and 2010, some of the mailing addresses may  
75 no longer be valid. As the communities could not provide individual's contact  
76 information to Manitoba Hydro without the individual's consent, Manitoba Hydro would  
77 have to contact each community that participated in an ATK workshop to request that  
78 the participants contact Manitoba Hydro to grant their consent to share their TK with the  
79 Province of Manitoba. Manitoba Hydro could not request that the community contact  
80 participants who chose to remain anonymous, therefore receiving the consent of  
81 individuals whose chose to remain anonymous would be particularly problematic.  
82 Therefore, obtaining consent would take considerable effort and time on both the part  
83 of Manitoba Hydro and the communities.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-003a

1 **Question:**

2 It appears that none of the 28 criteria used by Manitoba Hydro in the SSEA process  
3 included any criteria for subsistence or domestic use of land and resources, or other  
4 Aboriginal interests. Please identify how input from First Nations and Metis influenced  
5 the selection of the 28 criteria for use in site selection process, as the use of this dataset  
6 was critical in the selection of the FPR.

7 Please provide evidence from the consultation process undertaken by Manitoba Hydro  
8 with First Nations or Metis that no concerns (or preferably support) were identified for  
9 routing of FPR West Side of Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba by First Nations or  
10 Metis.

11 **Response:**

12 The 28 criteria selected for alternative route evaluation was done after three rounds of  
13 the Environmental Assessment Consultation Program (EACP). Leadership meetings and  
14 community open houses were conducted with First Nations and NACC Communities  
15 through that process. Meetings were also held with the MMF during the EACP rounds.  
16 Many issues and concerns were raised and they contributed to the selection of the  
17 criteria used for route evaluation. These included concerns regarding vegetation,  
18 mammals, birds, caribou, culture and heritage, resource use, and Treaty Land  
19 Entitlement. Criteria number 24 in the Route Selection Matrix (RSM) was Aboriginal  
20 Communities response. In addition the 28<sup>th</sup> criteria for the RSM, was the opportunity for  
21 inclusion of ATK in any of the first 18 criteria in the matrix. Please see information  
22 request *CEC/MH-II-003a* for additional information on the RSM.



23 It would be unrealistic to expect that there would be no concerns from a consultation  
24 program conducted for a project in a large area with multiple participants including First  
25 Nations and the Metis. Public consultation processes are designed to collect issues and  
26 concerns for incorporation into routing decisions and development of mitigation  
27 measures for the project. Manitoba Hydro has used the information gained through the  
28 EACP in an effort to address the issues identified, reduce the concerns and increase the  
29 acceptability of the Project to potentially affected participants. Manitoba Hydro has  
30 documented the outcomes of the EACP and included summaries and meeting notes from  
31 the process in the EACP Technical Report. Beginning on page 45 of the EACP Technical  
32 Report, the input is summarized, which includes an indication of route preference from  
33 community open houses, which were held in First Nations and NACC Communities  
34 during Round 3 of the EACP. Appendices F1 to F4 of the EACP Technical Report provides  
35 meeting notes from the meetings held throughout the EACP process. Manitoba Hydro  
36 continues to meet with First Nations, NACCs and the MMF to review and discuss  
37 measures to protect the environment, minimize potential effects, enhance opportunities  
38 and improve the design and implementation of the project.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-006a

1 **Question:**

2 As MH states, "Imperative to a successful SSEA process is the use of good data ...  
 3 Therefore, MH went to great lengths to acquire all available data relative to the Project  
 4 study area," please identify how spatial information was or was not used from the  
 5 Independent ATK Studies undertaken by individual First Nations and the MMF in the  
 6 SSEA process.

7 Please clarify if the Construction Phase Environmental Protection Plan has been  
 8 developed as suggested in this response.

9 **Response:**

10 Construction Phase Environmental Protection Plans (CEnvPP) are currently being  
 11 developed for tendering purposes for year one of construction. The CEnvPP plans will  
 12 incorporate spatial information from independent ATK Studies undertaken by individual  
 13 First Nations and the MMF in the SSEA process. These plans will be finalized upon  
 14 receipt of the licence.

15 The remaining CEnvPP plans will be developed as construction proceeds and will also  
 16 incorporate spatial information from independent ATK studies undertaken by individual  
 17 First Nations and the MMF.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-006e1

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify if Table 7, Table of Constraints (p.S7), Section 5.4 of the Traditional  
3 Knowledge Report # 1 is a comprehensive list of outstanding concerns of each First  
4 Nation and Metis community identified in the Table (specifically, Chemawawin, Dakota  
5 Plain, Dakota Tipi, Pine Creek, Waywayseecappo, Fox Lake First Nation, Long Plain First  
6 Nation, MMF, Opaskwayak Cree Nation, Swan Lake First Nation, Tataskweyak Creek  
7 Nation and Wuskwi Sipiik First Nation).

8 **Response:**

9 Table 7, Table of Constraints (page 87), Section 5.4 is a list of concerns that were  
10 expressed during the ATK Workshop Group and Key Person interviews and those taken  
11 from the Self-Directed Studies, where available. The list represents the concerns of  
12 those who participated in the ATK processes.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-006e2

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify what if any outstanding concerns remain for those First Nations or Metis  
3 communities consulted by Manitoba Hydro not identified in Table 7?

4 **Response:**

5 Table 7 was not intended to identify all outstanding concerns remaining for those First  
6 Nations and Metis as the list solely represents the concerns of those interviewed during  
7 the ATK process. The table was not meant to include the concerns raised during the  
8 Environmental Assessment Consultation Program (EACP), which are discussed in  
9 Chapter 5 and the EACP Technical Report.

10 Manitoba Hydro is offering to meet with communities to review the Draft Environmental  
11 Protection Plan for the Bipole III Transmission Project. The intent of these meetings is to  
12 review with communities the mitigation and monitoring plans Manitoba Hydro intends to  
13 put into place, and to discuss with communities the specific mitigation and monitoring  
14 activities that relate to the concerns raised by communities.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-006e3

1 **Question:**

2 Please clarify if items listed as "Concerns" in Table 7 are identified effects (using  
3 definitions outlined in Volume 1, Section 4.2.8 of the EIS)? If not, please clarify if  
4 Manitoba Hydro concurs with the identified concerns as described as requiring mitigation  
5 measures?

6 Please clarify if items listed as "Requirement" were mitigation measures identified by the  
7 First Nation or Metis community identified in Table 7. Also, please identify if these  
8 requirements were satisfied by Manitoba Hydro or if there are outstanding  
9 implementation concerns.

10 Please identify the nature of items identified as "Constraints" and if items listed as  
11 "Constraints" influenced the selection of the FPR? If no, please provide reasons why.

12 Please provide clarification on how Table 7 "Concerns" and Appendix 12 "Environmental  
13 Effects" of the Traditional Knowledge Report #1 are related (specifically for Pine Creek,  
14 Dakota Plains, Dakota Tipi). Also please clarify if Appendix 12 is a fulsome listing of  
15 sensitive sites collected by Manitoba Hydro? Also, please clarify if mitigation measures  
16 will be developed for each Env Eff as identified in Appendix 12.

17 Please identify if polygon locations identified in Appendix 12 can be reviewed can be  
18 reviewed by Pine Creek, Dakota Plains and Dakota Tipi for accuracy?

19 Please identify how Self-Directed ATK Studies influenced Appendix 12 or constraints  
20 mapping outlined in Chapter 7, Appendix 7A?

21 **Response:**

22 1) Please clarify if items listed as "Concerns" in Table 7 are identified effects (using  
23 definitions outlined in Volume 1, Section 4.2.8 of the EIS)? If not, please clarify if  
24 Manitoba Hydro concurs with the identified concerns as described as requiring  
25 mitigation measures?

26 The items listed as "Concerns in Table 7, Table of Constraints (p. 87), Section 5.4 of the  
27 Traditional Knowledge Report #1 are concerns that were expressed during the ATK  
28 Workshops during group interviews and Key Person Interviews and concerns identified  
29 through the Self-Directed Studies. The concerns are those expressed by individuals  
30 during the ATK workshop interviewing process. Manitoba Hydro reviewed the Table 7,  
31 Table of Constraints (p. 87), Section 5.4 of the Traditional Knowledge Report #1. No  
32 requests were made to revise the table.

33 2) Please clarify if items listed as "Requirement" were mitigation measures  
34 identified by the First Nation or Metis community identified in Table 7. Also,  
35 please identify if these requirements were satisfied by Manitoba Hydro or if there  
36 are outstanding implementation concerns.

37 From the communities' perspective "Requirement" meant something that needed to be  
38 considered and hopefully fixed. Manitoba Hydro continues to work with the communities  
39 to ensure that their concerns are addressed.

40 3) Please identify the nature of items identified as "Constraints" and if items listed  
41 as "Constraints" influenced the selection of the FPR? If no, please provide  
42 reasons why.

43 The nature of items identified as "Constraints" represents professional opinion based on  
44 the results of the ATK Workshops group and Key Person interviews and the Self-Directed  
45 Studies and knowledge of the existing heritage resources record. As ATK Workshop and  
46 Self-Directed Studies information was made available it was provided to Manitoba Hydro  
47 in the FPR process. Within the FPR, selection of the ATK points, lines and polygons that  
48 fell within the buffer zone were added to the table of Environmentally Sensitive Sites.

49 4) Please provide clarification on how Table 7 "Concerns" and Appendix 12  
50 "Environmental Effects" of the Traditional Knowledge Report #1 are related  
51 (specifically for Pine Creek, Dakota Plains, Dakota Tipi). Also please clarify if  
52 Appendix 12 is a fulsome listing of sensitive sites collected by Manitoba Hydro?  
53 Also, please clarify if mitigation measures will be developed for each Env Eff as  
54 identified in Appendix 12.

55 Table 7 represents high level concerns and the frequencies of repetitive concerns.  
56 Appendix 12 includes Environmentally Sensitive Sites identified during the mapping  
57 process for the ATK group workshops and Key Person Interviews.

58 The ESS is a fulsome listing of sensitive sites collected during the ATK workshops.

59 Should ESS sites fall within the FPR Manitoba Hydro will evaluate the ESS in discussion  
60 with the appropriate specialist and the Aboriginal community that identified the site to  
61 determine the mitigation measures to be applied.

62 5) Please identify if polygon locations identified in Appendix 12 can be reviewed can  
63 be reviewed by Pine Creek, Dakota Plains and Dakota Tipi for accuracy?

64 General ATK maps were sent to leadership of each community along with interview  
65 summaries as these were completed. Pine Creek and Dakota Plains have been sent ATK  
66 packages that contain consent forms, audio recordings, maps and transcripts.  
67 Anonymity is attached to some interviews at the request of the individual and will be  
68 respected as discussed in response to MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002j.

69 6) Please identify how Self-Directed ATK Studies influenced Appendix 12 or  
70 constraints mapping outlined in Chapter 7, Appendix 7A?

71 The Self-Directed Studies were received after the ATK ESS was submitted.  
72 Manitoba Hydro is offering to meet with communities to review the Draft Environmental  
73 Protection Plan for the Bipole III Transmission Project. The intent of these meetings is to  
74 review with communities the mitigation and monitoring plans Manitoba Hydro intends to  
75 put into place, and to discuss with communities the specific mitigation and monitoring  
76 activities that relate to the concerns raised by communities. Swan Lake's Self-Directed

- 77 Study provided important knowledge of cultural and heritage sites within their traditional  
78 lands.



<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-006e4

1 **Question:**

2 Please clarify the statement "remaining areas that are not accessible due to lack of  
3 permission to access will be monitored during construction"?

4 **Response:**

5 This refers to potential heritage sites that were identified through predictive modeling  
6 techniques but were not able to be investigated during the field season due to land  
7 owners not providing access permission. These sites will be monitored during  
8 construction for potential heritage resources, with the Heritage Resources Protection  
9 mitigation measures outlined in the EnvPP implemented if a heritage resource is found.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-008f

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify any plant communities of importance for gathering or plant communities  
3 of importance to support wildlife populations as identified by First Nations and Metis  
4 communities (as per questions #99 - 119, Appendix 5, Traditional Knowledge Report  
5 #1).

6 Please explain how Manitoba Hydro plans to involve this information in its mitigation  
7 efforts to prevent the spread of invasive plant species and noxious weeds to these areas  
8 during construction activities.

9 **Response:**

10 Plant communities of importance for gathering as identified by First Nations and Metis  
11 communities that were identified include: Cranberries, seneca root, blueberries, herbs  
12 and medicinal plants, strawberries, raspberries, maple syrup (done in past), moss  
13 berries, and sweetgrass. Copies of ATK maps containing all the information gathered  
14 during all Workshop interviews (group and Key Person), but without individual names,  
15 were sent to each Chief and Council and each NACC for their records, along with  
16 summaries of each interview.

17 Manitoba Hydro continues to spatially validate, evaluate and delineate these sensitive  
18 sites with First Nations and Metis. Mitigation measures, such as machine cleaning prior  
19 to arrival at the work site, continue to be developed through consultation with  
20 vegetation and weed control specialists to minimize the spread of invasives and noxious  
21 weeds during construction activities.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-010a

1 **Question:**

2 Please identify a complete listing of outstanding concerns identified by SLFN.

3 Please identify any issues and concerns SLFN has with the mitigation measures

4 identified in the outlined draft Environmental Protection Measures

5 Please identify the consultation process with SLFN that will be used to develop additional

6 mitigation measures for consideration by Manitoba Hydro in the EPP.

7 **Response:**

8 Manitoba Hydro has undertaken meetings with Swan Lake First Nation in relation to the

9 EPP and hopes to continue discussions with Swan Lake First Nation in an effort to

10 address the community's concerns and interests related to the Bipole III Transmission

11 Project traversing the Assiniboine Valley.

12 Issues of concern identified by Swan Lake First Nation that have been shared with

13 Manitoba Hydro to date include the following:

14 • The potential impact on sensitive sites in the vicinity of the Final Preferred Route  
15 including ceremony sites, burial sites, and sites with significant historical  
16 relevance

17 • Enforcement of the *Heritage Resources Act* and concerns that the Act does not  
18 take into account traditional practices

19 • The potential impact on resource harvesting and cultural activities

20 • The potential impact on their land claim

21 • Maintenance of the line, in particular emergency response plans

- 22       • The Community Development Initiative

23 Swan Lake First Nation has expressed the following concerns regarding the mitigation  
24 measures outlined in the draft Environmental Protection Plan:

- 25       • Need for more specific information regarding the specific concerns listed in Swan  
26 Lake's preliminary Traditional Knowledge, Botanical and Archeology reports, and  
27 review of the EIS report about the construction, operation and maintenance and  
28 decommissioning phases of the Bipole III Transmission Project particularly in the  
29 area where the Bipole III line crosses through southern Manitoba near Indian  
30 Gardens Reserve #8
- 31       • A need for commitment from Manitoba Hydro regarding how their concerns and  
32 knowledge were incorporated into the final route selection and will be  
33 incorporated into tower spotting, mitigation measures, monitoring, finalization  
34 and implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan and Emergency  
35 Response Plan

36 A detailed survey by the Project Archaeologist working with the Swan Lake First Nation  
37 archaeologist will be conducted prior to construction. Manitoba Hydro has also agreed to  
38 support an Environmental Monitor from Swan Lake First Nation to be on site during  
39 clearing and construction activities. Manitoba Hydro has offered to provide a  
40 presentation on the tower siting process to Swan Lake First Nation to allow the  
41 opportunity for the community to ask questions and share their concerns regarding the  
42 tower placement.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-010b

1 **Question:**

- 2 Please identify how Environmentally Sensitive Sites were (or will be) identified with First  
3 Nations and Metis communities for use in the development of the final EEP or  
4 construction Phase Environmental Protection Plans?

5 **Response:**

- 6 Please refer to the response provided in *MCWS/MH-TAC-II-002a*.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-011b

1 **Question:**

2 Please clarify if Response 011 a, 011b and 011c is meant to address all comments  
3 identified in MMF submissions dated March 16, 2012?

4 **Response:**

5 Response 011a, 011b and 011c were not meant to address all comments identified in  
6 the MMF submissions dated March 16, 2012.

<b>Date</b>	August 27 2012
<b>Reference</b>	
<b>Source</b>	MCWS_08_27_2012
<b>Question</b>	MCWS/MH-TAC-II-011c

1 **Question:**

2 Please describe the manner in which "clearly identified sensitive sites" will be inventoried  
 3 by Manitoba Hydro for non-chemical vegetation management for First Nations and the  
 4 MMF?

5 **Response:**

6 Sensitive sites identified through ATK workshops and self directed studies were  
 7 delineated at very large scales and need to be spatially validated with high resolution  
 8 imagery and ground truthing to delineate accurate boundaries of sensitive sites. Once  
 9 delineated non-chemical vegetation management techniques can be evaluated.