



PR 304 TO BERENS RIVER ALL-SEASON ROAD ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX 6.1 Traditional Knowledge Report

August 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6.0	INTRODUCTION	1
6.1	METHODOLOGY	1
6.1.1	<i>Identification of Traditional Land Boundaries</i>	2
6.1.2	<i>Development of an Interview/Survey Format and Maps</i>	2
6.1.3	<i>Identification of a Local Coordinator</i>	2
6.1.4	<i>Establishment of a Confidentiality and TEK Ownership Agreement</i>	3
6.1.5	<i>Analysis of TEK Information</i>	3
6.2	TRENDS DERIVED FROM INTERVIEW AND SURVEY RESULTS	4
6.3	RESPONDENTS OPINION AND IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS AND SUGGESTED MITIGATION	6
6.3.1	<i>Poplar River</i>	6
6.3.2	<i>Bloodvein</i>	20
6.3.3	<i>Berens River</i>	33
6.3.4	<i>Pauingassi</i>	43
6.3.5	<i>Hollow Water</i>	54
6.3.6	<i>Little Grand Rapids</i>	67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE A6 - 1:	POPLAR RIVER – RESPONDENTS VIEW OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF ALL-SEASON ROAD ON TRAPPING.....	7
TABLE A6 - 2:	POPLAR RIVER – MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED TO REDUCE IMPACTS TO TRAPPING ACTIVITY.....	8
TABLE A6 - 3:	POPLAR RIVER –RESPONDENTS VIEWS OF THE EFFECTS OF ALL-SEASON ROAD ON LARGE AND SMALL GAME HUNTING ACTIVITY BY THE ALL-SEASON ROAD.....	10
TABLE A6 - 4:	POPLAR RIVER SUGGESTED MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE IMPACTS TO LARGE AND SMALL GAME HUNTING ACTIVITY.....	10
TABLE A6 - 5:	POPLAR RIVER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF ALL-SEASON ROAD ON BIRD HUNTING ACTIVITY.....	12
TABLE A6 - 6:	POPLAR RIVER - MITIGATION MEASURES RESPONDENTS SUGGESTED TO REDUCE IMPACTS TO BIRD HUNTING ACTIVITY.....	13
TABLE A6 - 7:	POPLAR RIVER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF ALL-SEASON ROAD ON FISHING ACTIVITY.....	15
TABLE A6 - 8:	POPLAR RIVER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS TO FISHING ACTIVITY.....	15
TABLE A6 - 9:	BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF ALL-SEASON ROAD ON TRAPPING ACTIVITY.....	21
TABLE A6 - 10:	BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS SUGGESTED MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON TRAPPING ACTIVITY.....	22
TABLE A6 - 11:	BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF ALL-SEASON ROAD ON LARGE AND SMALL GAME HUNTING ACTIVITY.....	23
TABLE A6 - 12:	BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS SUGGESTED MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE IMPACTS TO LARGE AND SMALL GAME HUNTING ACTIVITY.....	24

TABLE A6 - 13: BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL	25
TABLE A6 - 14: BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS SUGGESTED MITIGATION	26
TABLE A6 - 15: BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON	27
TABLE A6 - 16: BLOODVEIN - RESPONDENTS SUGGESTED MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE IMPACTS TO FISHING ACTIVITY	28
TABLE A6 - 17: BERENS RIVER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL.....	34
TABLE A6 - 18: BERENS RIVER – MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY.....	35
TABLE A6 - 19: BERENS RIVER – RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL.....	36
TABLE A6 - 20: BERENS RIVER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS .	37
TABLE A6 - 21: BERENS RIVER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL.....	38
TABLE A6 - 22: BERENS RIVER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS..	39
TABLE A6 - 23: BERENS RIVER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON	40
TABLE A6 - 24: BERENS RIVER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY.....	40
TABLE A6 - 25: PAUINGASSI - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	43
TABLE A6 - 26: PAUINGASSI - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON TRAPPING ACTIVITY.....	44
TABLE A6 - 27: PAUINGASSI - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL	46
TABLE A6 - 28: PAUINGASSI - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS	47
TABLE A6 - 29: PAUINGASSI - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	48
TABLE A6 - 30: PAUINGASSI - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON BIRD HUNTING ACTIVITY	49
TABLE A6 - 31: PAUINGASSI - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	50
TABLE A6 - 32: PAUINGASSI - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS	51
TABLE A6 - 33: HOLLOW WATER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	55
TABLE A6 - 34: HOLLOW WATER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY	56
TABLE A6 - 35: HOLLOW WATER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL	58
TABLE A6 - 36: HOLLOW WATER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON LARGE AND SMALL GAME HUNTING ACTIVITY	59
TABLE A6 - 37: HOLLOW WATER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	60
TABLE A6 - 38: HOLLOW WATER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY	60
TABLE A6 - 39: HOLLOW WATER - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	62
TABLE A6 - 40: HOLLOW WATER - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED	62
TABLE A6 - 41: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	68
TABLE A6 - 42: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON TRAPPING ACTIVITY	69
TABLE A6 - 43: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON POTENTIAL	71
TABLE A6 - 44: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON LARGE AND SMALL GAME	71
TABLE A6 - 45: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	72
TABLE A6 - 46: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS- MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON HUNTING BIRDS ACTIVITY	73
TABLE A6 - 47: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS - RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON.....	74
TABLE A6 - 48: LITTLE GRAND RAPIDS - MITIGATION MEASURES SUGGESTED BY RESPONDENTS TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON FISHING ACTIVITY	75

6.0 INTRODUCTION

Aboriginal Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) is an important component of the Environmental Assessment of the Provincial Road 304 to Berens River. It was determined at the outset of the project that information from community members was required to enhance the existing knowledge pertaining to current traditional land use, culturally sensitive areas, as well as gathering comments regarding the effects that the Project might have on both. In addition to obtaining traditional ecological knowledge from the local community members within the Project study area, conducting the TEK study is also a way to inform community members about the Project and to seek opinions and comments.

Reflecting the population of the First Nations and NAC communities, the TEK Study was inclusive of all aboriginal people within the study area communities, including First Nations, Métis and non-status First Nations. As described in the methodology below, the selection of interviewees was not based on particular status, although all respondents were aboriginal.

6.1 Methodology

The approach for this study required rigorous planning to initiate the community meetings. In order to gain valuable TEK information, it was important to engage the community and bring awareness about the major components of the project to the community. The first set of meetings took place from March 2009 to June 2009, to introduce the project, including the need and purpose, describe the EA process, and TK study program. The second set of community meetings will take place after the filing of the Environmental Impact Assessment, to describe the results of the TK data, impact assessment analysis (albeit negative or positive effects) of the preferred route option and identification of mitigation measure or agreements to address any adverse environmental and social effects as a result of the project.

Details of the methodology for the TEK study are provided in the following sections.

The purpose of the local TEK Survey was to update the existing baseline data for the EIA study area and to solicit input from the respondents regarding their use of land for traditional activities; areas considered spiritually and culturally important; and to obtain input on their perception of the potential impacts of development and operation of the PR 304 to Berens River All-season Road on traditional uses of lands within the study area, as well as other cultural activities.

The steps followed to perform the TEK Survey are the following:

- Identification of traditional Land boundaries
- Development of a Survey / Interview Questionnaire and Maps
- Identification of local Coordinators
- Establishment of a Confidentiality and TEK ownership Agreement

- Analysis of TEK information

6.1.1 Identification of Traditional Land Boundaries

Traditional land boundaries for the communities within the study area were obtained from Promises to Keep, East Side Planning Initiative (ESPI), 2004/ National Topographic Data Base (NTDB) 1:50,000, Government of Canada, Natural Resources Canada. Centre for Topographic Information 2003/ Manitoba Land Information (MLI) 2009. The Map is intended for illustrative purposes only, to help analysts determine the extent of potential impacts and to define the study area for the Project. In addition, the study will aid in identifying traditional lands that usually coincides with trap line areas. These are not legally constituted boundaries. Community traditional land boundaries are shown on Figure 6.1.

6.1.2 Development of an Interview/Survey Format and Maps

The interview form / questionnaire, as well as the maps prepared for geographic depiction of the information, were developed by SNC-Lavalin using prior TEK studies for guidance. Templates of the survey form are provided in Appendix 6.2. The map was a basic topographic map of the area at a scale appropriate to demonstrate the full extent of the community's traditional lands.

Each community received a map of the area of the project surrounding their area in order to show the limits of the different activities performed in the community.

6.1.3 Identification of a Local Coordinator

A local TK Coordinator was identified in each community within the study area. The specific role of the Coordinators is described in Appendix 6.2. In summary, the TK Coordinators responsibilities are the following:

- To identify leaders from within the community who are considered holders of the community's traditional knowledge (elders, trappers, hunters, etc.) for personal interviews. The Elders should be recognized by the community for his/her significant knowledge of traditional lands and community culture. In addition, the Elder must be a significant user of traditional lands and is recognized as a leader by community members for retaining this knowledge
- TK Coordinator was to conduct interviews with the identified community leaders/elders, using a survey form and prepared maps to record answers and comments. In most communities, approximately 25 to 30 interviewees were selected for an interview.
- Upon completion of interviews, TK coordinators are to be responsible for the shipment of surveys and maps to SNC-Lavalin Inc. (SLI). TK data is expected to be recorded on the surveys and maps. TK Coordinators are then

responsible for shipment of surveys to SNC-Lavalin Inc. (SLI) for processing and analysis.

6.1.4 Establishment of a Confidentiality and TEK Ownership Agreement

Aboriginal Communities own the intellectual property rights to their traditional knowledge, despite it being recorded in any way. As such, a confidentiality agreement was created for each of the respondents to sign. This agreement is between East Side Road Authority (ESRA), TK Coordinator along with the participants of the study. It is acknowledged that any information provided by the respondent may include proprietary and confidential information, including, but not limited to, local or community historic knowledge, ideas, perspectives, comments and opinions, traditions, practices, values or belief systems, not previously disclosed to the general public. As such, the information provided by the respondents will strictly be kept confidential and held by ESRA, its officers, employees and agents, and the TK Coordinator in confidence to ensure that such information will not be published, revealed or disclosed to any other person. Personal data or copies of the completed surveys will not be released. When referring to certain respondents and using their quotes as examples, they will be identified by a respondent code so as to not reveal who is making the comments. A copy of the Confidentiality Agreement is attached to this Appendix 6.2.

6.1.5 Analysis of TEK Information

The information obtained from the questionnaires of the Survey was organized in tables by community and according to the performed activity including:

- Trapping activity,
- Moose Hunting
- Caribou Hunting
- Small game hunting,
- Waterfowl and birds hunting,
- Fishing and fish spawning areas,
- Berry picking and other gathering areas,
- Cultural areas

The tables show the number of people responding to each question of the survey and provide the percentage of answers from each community, showing the opinion of each community regarding the traditional activities.

The analysis of the results and information obtained through the survey/interview process is presented in this Section of the study. A detailed description of the results is provided in Appendix 6.2.

6.2 Trends Derived from Interview and Survey Results

Intersection of Alignment

Based on the surveys collected during the TK study, as well as the maps produced to summarize where traditional activities occur, it appears that the route alignment does not intersect the areas of concentrated traditional activity to a major degree. The preferred shoreline route extending from Bloodvein to Berens River is following the existing route and staying close to the shore, avoiding the main areas of traditional activity.

Patterns of Caribou and Moose Hunting

The act of hunting is of major importance to aboriginal people, as it provides them a means of subsistence, as food for themselves, for their family or for spiritual purposes. Hunting is also a means of income as Aboriginals are able to sell or trade what they hunted for. The survey results reveal that the majority of each community sample of participants actively hunts; these communities include Poplar River (40 of 43; or 93%), Bloodvein (22 of 31; or 71%), Little Grand Rapids (29 of 33; or 88%), Pauingassi (15 of 20; or 75%) and Hollow Water (22 of 30; or 73%).

Poplar River respondents have identified their moose hunting areas along the Poplar River up to Weaver Lake, as well as throughout the Poplar River traditional lands. There appears to be a trend within Poplar River that there are more caribou hunters throughout their traditional lands in comparison to the neighbouring communities in the south.

Respondents of Bloodvein reveal that moose hunting principally occurs along the Rice River Road and winter road corridors (up to Road Lake), and along the Leyond River. Whereas caribou hunting occurs in similar areas as moose hunting; however, not along the Rice River Road corridor.

Moose hunting for the respondents of Little Grand Rapids appears to occur throughout the community's traditional lands, east of the winter road, and in close proximities to Family Lake. Respondents have indicated that caribou hunting is not prevalent in the area; however some do hunt caribou in similar areas.

Pauingassi moose and caribou hunting areas are similar to that of Little Grand Rapids. The majority of the respondents have indicated that they are involved in moose hunting, east of the winter road and throughout the traditional lands around Family Lake.

The respondents of Hollow Water have indicated that moose hunting occurs on Black Island. However, caribou hunting is limited in this area.

In terms of moose and caribou hunting in Berens River, 15 of the 37 respondents (or 40.5%) actively hunt, which is a smaller group of hunters in comparison to the other

respondents from the rest of the communities. It has been noted by the respondents that hunting caribou is not a common activity for the respondents.

Patterns of Fishing

The traditional activity of fishing seems to be quite prevalent throughout the communities of the study area. Similar to that of hunting, fishing is an important traditional activity for Aboriginals, as it provides them a mean of sustenance, for it is a source of food and/or income. A portion of the community respondents have indicated during the TK interviews that they are commercial fishermen. When listing the types of fish that are sought for, majority of the respondents indicated that the importance of fishing is for food and income.

It has been noted by 47 (24%) of the respondents that there will be no negative effects on fishing. Rather, it could be a positive effect for the community members as a road provides the fisherman greater opportunities and benefits. With a road, there will be greater access to fish, especially since the preferred shoreline route is planned to travel along the coast.

Based on the data provided by the respondents, it appears that fishing is concentrated in rivers and lakes within close proximity of their respective communities. Respondents of Berens River have indicated that there is a concentration of fishing in Berens River, as well as in Pigeon River, within the vicinity of the community. Bloodvein respondents have indicated that fishing predominantly occurs in the Bloodvein River. For the community of Hollow Water, fishing occurs around Black Island, Deer Island, and along the Rice River Road. Respondents from the Little Grand Rapids and Pauingassi areas, primarily occurs in Family Lake, in close proximity with their communities.

6.3 Respondents Opinion and identification of Potential effects and suggested Mitigation

6.3.1 Poplar River

Trapping

Poplar River had the highest amount of respondents with various opinions about the proposed works. Of the 43 participants, 35 actively trap. Of those that trap, 30 answered “No” when asked whether any of the route options affect their trap lines. Respondents that gave reasons as to why the route options will not affect their trap lines mentioned that it is because the routes are not in the vicinity of their trap lines:

- “No, trapline is in the middle and away from the area.” (PR13)
- “No, I don’t think because it’s out of the way.” (PR29)
- “No, it will be far from it.” (PR33)
- “No, trapline is away from route.” (PR36)

Only a small amount of the participants – being 7 – responded giving an answer of “Yes” to the question of whether or not the route options will affect their trap lines. Those that were concerned said:

- “Yes, probably (most likely). Animals will leave or move away from area.” (PR16)
- “Yes, it will be my immediate area.” (PR26)
- “Yes, it will help for easier access.” (PR28)

The remaining 3 respondents either did not provide a concern about the road affecting their trap lines, or they were not trappers.

Furthermore, another effects question was asked about whether or not the road will make it harder for the trappers to get the same number of animals. The majority of the participants (31) said “No” that it will not make it harder for them to trap the same number of animals, while 7 respondents said “Yes.”

In addition to providing their input and their concerns regarding the route options, the respondents were asked to fill out a chart listing other impacts which they think the road may cause. Table A6-1 below demonstrates how many respondents agree that the suggested impact may occur in the area due to the road.

Table A6 - 1: Poplar River – Respondents View of Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Trapping

Potential Effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to trap	7
More animals to trap	2
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to trap	6
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to trap	6
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping	4
New access to trap lines for others to use	20
New hunting area for the community to explore	21
New or more animals resulting in more animals to trap	5
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to trap (fatalities)	4
Increased participation / interest in trapping	7

It appears that the majority of the respondents believe that the impacts will be a “new access to trap lines for others to use”, as well as a “new hunting area for the community to explore”. Some respondents also indicated some concerns of theirs that were not listed on the impact chart. Their concerns were generally of the same idea, regarding disturbance of the area and/or trap lines; for instance:

- “Less trapping activity due increased use of area (road).” (PR16)
- “Conservation/game wardens bothering native hunters and trap lines.” (PR19)
- “Only certain people allowed to go to trap lines.” (PR20)
- “Animals will leave and habitat disturbed (translated).” (PR27)
- “If an animal gets disturbed in their natural habitat, the animal will leave and will not return.” (PR31)

In addition to providing input on the impacts that the respondents think may occur they were also given the opportunity to check off the suggested mitigation measures. It appears that the most suggested mitigation is to ensure road construction and operation

is implemented in an environmental responsible way. Table A6-2 below demonstrates how many people suggested what the mitigation measures should be:

Table A6 - 2: Poplar River – Mitigation Measures Suggested to Reduce Impacts to Trapping Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	14
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	4
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	9
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	5
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	30

When asked about when the impacts will occur, either during construction or operation, as well as to provide other comments or opinions, most of the respondents were concerned about the noise during construction. The comments were as follows:

- “Lots of machinery and loud activity.” (PR16)
- “Lots of noise might scare away animals. Only when they start or during construction.” (PR26)
- “During construction disturbing natural habitat (translation from Salteaux).” (PR27)

Not many of the participants were too concerned about the impacts happening during the operation phase. Those that were concerned were afraid of the animals getting killed (“Usage – animals getting killed on road,” PR16); or that there will be environmental impacts (“More environmental impacts especially in water that flows through our community,” PR26); or about the traffic (“More activity and increased traffic,” PR40).

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting

Of the 43 respondents, 40 actively hunt. The participants were asked to indicate whether or not the route options will affect their hunting areas. The majority of those that actively hunt either moose, caribou or small game, feel as though that the route options will not affect their hunting areas (32 think that it will not affect the moose hunt area; 13 think it will not affect the caribou hunt area; and 30 think it will not affect the small game hunt area).

The participants were asked to provide comments on what impacts may occur during the construction and operation phases of the project. Based on the comments that were provided, noise seems to be the main concern that the participants have as the “machines will be loud. Animals will move but will gradually come back” (PR10). One individual was also concerned about the animals being disturbed and leaving by stating, “Animals will leave to increased activity and noise in their natural habitat. They will move” (PR16). Another individual was concerned about the increased activity that construction will bring – “During construction. Increased activity and added noise and temporary roads and clearing” (PR40). In terms of the operation phase, not many respondents were concerned. There were comments, however, regarding the traffic, as one participant said, “Increase traffic flow to the north where there is otherwise no noise” (PR13). As for stating any other comments or opinions they have, only two responded. One individual said “Usage can cause fires by human carelessness” (PR20), while another stated, “Not natural to habitat, animals and small game will move” (PR26).

In addition to indicating whether or not the route option will affect their moose, caribou or hunting areas, the participants were asked to fill out a check box of all the impacts which they think may occur during the construction or operation phases of the project. It is apparent that there is a lot of concern about new access to hunting areas for others to use, as well as new hunting areas for the community to explore. Table A6-3 demonstrates what the participants think some impacts may be.

Table A6 - 3: Poplar River –Respondents Views of the Effects of All-Season Road on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity by the All-Season Road

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to hunt	7
More amount of animals to hunt	3
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to hunt	6
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to hunt	3
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	3
New access to hunting areas for others to use	21
New hunting areas for the community to explore	22
In-migration of new or more animals resulting in more animals to hunt	2
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	3
Increased participation / interest in hunting	8

Along with the suggested impacts the route options may impose, the participants were asked to check off the mitigations which they feel should be implemented. The table below demonstrates the suggested mitigation measures the project should take. Table A6-4 shows that the majority of respondents feel that the road should be patrolled and that the construction phase should be implemented in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 4: Poplar River Suggested Mitigation Measures to Reduce Impacts to Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	20
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	6
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	11
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	10
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	30

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting Birds

Of the 43 participants, 42 have indicated that they actively hunt birds. Of those that actively hunt birds, 37 have responded “No” when asked if the route options will affect bird hunting in any of the areas.

Respondents were given the opportunity to express their concerns and provide comments on the route options. Similar to that of trapping and hunting, the participants perceive that most of the impacts will occur during the construction phase. The main concern seems to be noise in the vicinity, as PR13 says, “During this time. Why? Noise”; or as PR39 says, “During this time, it will increase activity and noise.” Other comments were related to the construction activities of the projects. For instance, PR40 states “During construction – clearing and temporary roads and choppers”; or as PR42 says, “Lots of workers and activity but more and more will still come anyway.” Moreover, with respect to the operation phase of the project, there seems to be concerns with outsiders entering the area as PR35 mentions, “Control with regulations on any new hunters and trappers.” Furthermore, traffic also seems to be an issue for the participants, including PR5 “Traffic” and PR41 “Yes – Traffic.” While others, such as PR16, had a concern for the animals by stating, “More food destroyed (road kill).” Participants were also asked to provide any additional comments. PR16 stated “Many will mis-use game/hunting for targets or kill them for nothing.” PR31 expressed a concern for pollution in the area by stating, “Maybe if areas are polluted. We have to be careful for pollution. To care for the land and water.”

Along with their comments regarding the impacts during the construction and operation phases, participants were asked to fill out a check box of other effects that may occur in the general vicinity of their hunting areas. Table A6-5 below illustrates the number of times the suggested impact was checked off, meaning that the participants agree with those effects occurring. Based on the information below, the participants seem to be concerned with new access to hunting areas for others to use, and new hunting areas for the community to explore.

Table A6 - 5: Poplar River - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Bird Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	3
More amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	1
Disrupted migration of birds and waterfowl leading to less amount of animals to hunt	3
Habitat destruction leading to less birds and waterfowl to hunt	4
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	2
New access to hunting areas for others to use	14
New hunting areas for the community to explore	13
In-migration of new or more birds and waterfowl resulting in more animals to hunt	0
Increased accidents between road users and birds and waterfowl resulting in less to birds and waterfowl to hunt (fatalities)	0
Increased participation / interest in hunting	6

Along with the impact chart for the participants to fill out, they were also asked to fill out a similar chart, indicating the suggested mitigation measures. Table A6-6 below demonstrates what the participants think the mitigation measures should be. The majority of the respondents indicated that the road construction and operation should be implemented in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 6: Poplar River - Mitigation Measures Respondents Suggested to Reduce Impacts to Bird Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	11
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	4
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	6
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	8
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	32

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Fishing

Of the 43 participants, 39 have indicated that they actively fish. Of those that actively fish, 28 had indicated that the spawning areas will not be affected. Participants feel as though there will not be any effects as long as the process is monitored. Respondent PR29 states, “No, as long as they watch these areas”; or as PR39 mentions “No, I don’t think so, as long as it is monitored.” PR42 is also in agreement by saying, “As long as it is done properly, (one from poplar should work there to make sure this is done). There won’t happen (impacts) if it is done right and consideration for every thing.” Only two expressed concerns in terms of the proposed routes affecting the spawning areas:

- “Yes, less fish. They will no longer get to their areas.” (PR16)
- “Yes, controlled environments and maybe limit access to spawning areas.” (PR26).

The participants were given the opportunity to provide their input on what they think the impacts will be during the construction and operation phases. Of the 39 that answered this question, 26 of the respondents did not give any answer for the question regarding the impacts of the construction phase. However, those that did provide answers indicated that there will be impacts. Four (4) respondents were concerned about the creeks and rivers:

- “Maybe here. Watch creeks and rivers.” (PR33)
- “During construction as long as they don’t close off rivers and creeks.” (PR36)
- “As long as there are no blocking rivers and creeks.” (PR37)
- “That rivers and creeks are not covered or closed.” (PR38)

As for comments regarding the operation phase of the project, 32 did not provide any opinion. However, of those that did, they had issues with the operation process. For instance, PR18 wants the road to be regulated, as stated: “When it’s in use regulate the flow of traffic + peoples.” PR20 is also in agreement by stating, “Control with patrols and signage.” There were others who were concerned with outsiders entering the community to fish. For instance, PR39 says that “during this time more people will fish in our area.” PR40 also agrees with this notion by stating, “More people will want to come to our pristine area.” In terms of giving other concerns or opinions, the respondents did not have anything to say.

With respect to other effects which they think will occur, participants were given a check box to fill, by indicating which other effects they think the new road will bring. According to the participants, the main impacts that will occur in the vicinity of the fishing areas are: new access to fishing area for others to use, and new fishing areas for the community to explore.

Table A6 - 7: Poplar River - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Fishing Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less fish	3
More fish	2
Disrupted migration of animals preying on fish which leads to larger amount of fish to hunt	1
Habitat destruction leading to less fish species to hunt	2
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less fishing	2
New access to fishing area for others to use	16
New fishing areas for the community to explore	19
In-migration of new animals resulting in less fish.	1
Potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals you hunt / trap	4
Increased participation / interest in fishing	2

Along with the perceived impacts the route options may have, participants were asked to indicate what their suggested mitigation measures would be. The table below illustrates what mitigation measures the people want implemented. According to the respondents, the top three mitigation measures are: ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way; provide road patrolling; and provide road blocks where access to trap lines begins.

Table A6 - 8: Poplar River - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts to Fishing Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	12
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	3
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	9
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	12
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	30

Spawning

Knowledge of spawning is important to the MBR Project as it may assist in localizing the sensitive areas and therefore minimize impacts. Out of the 43 respondents, 39 answered this question; 23 participants indicated knowledge of spawning areas, while 30 of them seem to know which types of fish spawn.

Those who did know of spawning areas responded by stating: a) fish types; and b) traditional spawning activity. Fish types include: white fish; red sucker; pickerel; jackfish; perch; mullet; mariah; pike; sturgeon; brook trout; and gold eye. According to the respondents, these fish will spawn in creeks, rapids and rivers. Thus, there are concerns with the route options affecting the fishing spawn areas. For instance:

- “Yes, less fish. They will no longer get to their areas.” (PR16)
- “As long as they don’t block rivers and creeks.” (PR23)
- “Yes, controlled environments and maybe limits access to spawnings areas.” (PR26)

See Appendix 6.2 for full list of comments.

General Wildlife

With respect to wildlife, majority of the respondents have indicated that they know where there are lynx, wolves, bears and other predator animals. Of the 43 respondents, 37 have indicated they know where lynx are; 36 respondents have shown they know of wolves; and 36 have stated they know where bears are. According to the respondents, other predator animals within the area seem to be: squirrels (PR22); and beavers and muskrats (PR43). When asked if the road will affect predator routes, only 4 of the 43 participants responded with “yes”. Majority of the respondents were not concerned with the predator routes being affected, for example:

- “Road will not affect predators.” (PR4)
- “Maybe, not natural in their habitat to have this lynx in the community.” (PR26)
- “Wolves in bushes and open areas to survive. Mostly bears survive anywhere.” (PR31)
- “No, unless they’re scared away.” (PR37)

Participants were also asked if they know of any eagle, hawk, osprey, falcon, owl, heron, and other bird nests. Of the 43 participants, 32 indicated that they know of these animals.

Furthermore, the participants were asked if they know of any effects that may have on the existing environment. Only 3 people of the 43 responded with “Yes”; the respondents were:

- “Yes, increase activities and human presence.” (PR26)
- “Yes, definitely.” (PR36)
- “Oh, yes.” (PR37)

The rest of the respondents answered “No” to the question as they think there are no impacts on the existing government. Some of the responses were:

- “I don’t think it will affect too much.” (PR13)
- “It shouldn’t if done properly.” (PR32)
- “No, as long as it’s done right the first time.” (PR37)

Finally, respondents were asked to provide some input on what problems the Project should be aware of. Of the 43 respondents, 19 provided their thoughts on this issue. According to the majority of the answers, there seems to be concern with outsiders gaining access to the community, as mentioned below:

- “Yes, bad humans from south.” (PR12)
- “Other people coming in.” (PR20)
- “More traffic or people will come to our area.” (PR28).

There is also concern with drugs and alcohol abuse within the community:

- “No, maybe booze and drugs. Set up inspection/check points.” (PR29)
- “Drugs and alcohol in community.” (PR35)

Amongst the comments problems that were provided, PR17 mentioned that there will be good effects with the road by stating, “More traffic for sure, maybe more accidents. Good effects – get groceries cheaper; cost of fuel will go down.”

For detailed list of all comments regarding the general wildlife, see Appendix 6.2.

Cultural Areas

Participants were asked to answer questions regarding various cultural areas including burial and historical grounds; medicinal areas; berry gathering; and other areas. The respondents were asked to check off either “yes”, “no” or “not in the area”. Of the 43 respondents, 28 have indicated that they know of burial grounds and historical

settlement/camps in the area. 21 of the participants have indicated that they know of medicinal areas. While 33 of the respondents have indicated they know of berry gathering areas. Only 4 participants knew of other areas to avoid.

When asked if there are other areas to avoid by the project, 39 of the 43 participants replied 'No'. However, those that did reply with "other areas to avoid" stated that the reasons for avoiding such areas were for: burial grounds, medicinal areas and berry gathering areas. The few comments that were noted were:

- "Burial grounds." (PR6)
- "Identified burial grounds you have gathered from study in the region." (PR16)
- "Muskeg berries also." (PR17)
- "Some years are good for berries, sometimes there's nothing." (PR21)
- "Medicinal, burials, berries." (PR26)

When asked about if whether or not they believe the new road will affect their access or access by others to their areas of interest/traditional lands, 7 participants replied with "yes", and provided reasons for why they are concerned with the new effects that the road will bring. According to the respondents, concerns were: traffic (PR8); people gaining more access to hunting/trapping areas (PR14, PR39, PR42); and the animals inhabiting the area (PR26, PR40).

Lastly, participants were given the chance to give any other information they would like to share with the project team that will aid in understanding how the road may affect them, their community and surrounding environment. The majority of the participants (40 out of 43) responded by either saying No or giving their opinions. To some of respondents, the road will bring them positive effects including cheaper costs for food and fuel. Those that indicated these positive effects said:

- "Cheaper costs for fuel + food and pavement on reserve." (PR10)
- "Maybe it will be better, food will be cheaper. Flour 20 lbs are about \$36.00." (PR11)
- "It will be good – cheaper food, gas, lumber, access. Finally costs are high 4L milk \$12.99." (PR13)
- "Transportation costs will go down – easier access for other communities – cost of living will go down – maybe better houses." (PR34)
- "It will be better, I think, our potatoes at the how for 10 lbs is \$22.00. Maybe food will be cheaper." (PR42)

Other good effects were mentioned by the respondents, as the road may benefit the community on a social aspect, for instance:

- “No negative impacts rather positive impact for community of Poplar River in terms of access to WPG where all supplies are hauled from. Build road already yesterday.” (PR12)
- “Young people will live definitely in the future, so the road will be a benefit to them. Road is a good thing; although, I might not see it. I’m 79. I’ll be glad to see the road.” (PR21)
- “It would be nice to have road to south and other communities.” (PR32)
- There are also some negative effects which the respondents feel will be a result of the road, including environmental effects. Such concerns include:
 - “Flooding, disrupting beavers and dams water ways creeks in land lakes. Forest fires peat moss.” (PR8)
 - “Lots of distraction and loss of old ways. Medicinal knowledge destroyed trapping areas.”

For a full list of comments regarding cultural areas, see Appendix 6.2.

6.3.2 Bloodvein

Trapping

Bloodvein had a number of respondents with various opinions about the proposed road. Of the 31 participants, 14 actively trap. When asked whether or not any of the route options will affect their traplines, 20 replied “No.” Respondents gave reasons as to why the route options will not affect their traplines; rather the home block may be affected:

- “Not #5, but probably the home block will be affected.” (BV2)
- “No my trapline, just home block and river affect #13 and #14.”(BV20)

However, 4 of the 31 respondents presented their concerns with the impact of new road on their traplines. Such concerns were:

- “Yes, it affects the animals and the water (beaver, muskrat) everything will be affected.” (BV8)
- “People (trappers) will lose their supplies if there is no one watching who comes and goes.” (BV13)
- “The animals will leave area.” (BV24)
- “Only if other people go to the trapline should only be for family (young).” (BV29)

Furthermore, another effects question was asked about whether or not the road will make it harder for the trappers to get the same number of animals. Of the 31 respondents, 14 have said that the road will not affect their traplines, while 7 have said that it will affect their traplines.

In addition to providing their input and their concerns with the route options, the respondents were asked to check off other impacts which they think may affect the road. Table A6-9 below demonstrates how many respondents agree that the suggested impact may occur in the area due to the road.

Table A6 - 9: Bloodvein - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Trapping Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to trap	12
More animals to trap	2
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to trap	11
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to trap	14
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping	9
New access to trap lines for others to use	11
New hunting area for the community to explore	16
New or more animals resulting in more animals to trap	2
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	16
Increased participation / interest in trapping	12

It appears that the majority of the respondents believe that the impacts will be “new access to trap lines for others to use”, as well as “new hunting area for the community to explore”. Some respondents also indicated some concerns of theirs that were not listed on the impact chart. Their concerns were generally of the same idea, regarding other people disturbing the area; for instance:

- “Pouchers we see traps from people not from Bloodvein.” (BV5)
- “People coming from the south in fall for moose hunting (sport hunting). There used to be lots of moose tracks in trapline in the past winter. No moose tracks what so ever. Just timber wolves, marten.” (BV10)

An environmental concern has been presented as an effect not mentioned in the impact table by BV20, who said that “chemicals and machine. Oil and diesel leaking.”

In addition to commenting on the impacts which the respondents think may occur, they were also given the opportunity to check off the suggested mitigation measures. It appears that the most suggested mitigation is to provide road patrolling. Table A6-10 below demonstrates how many people suggested what the mitigation measures should be:

Table A6 - 10: Bloodvein - Respondents Suggested Mitigation Measures to Reduce Impacts on Trapping Activity

Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	19
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	15
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	16
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	16
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	17

When asked about when the impacts will occur, either during construction or operation, as well as to provide other comments or opinions, most of the respondents were concerned about the construction activities. There is no variation on the comments regarding the activities that will take place during construction. Of the 31 respondents, 9 replied with a “Yes.” Participant BV29 has suggested monitoring construction by stating, “During this time we have to monitor construction.”

Not many of the participants were concerned about the impacts happening during the operation phase. Of the 31 respondents, 6 have replied ‘Yes’; 5 replied ‘No’; and 13 provided no answer (N/A). There was one concern provided by BV29, as they were concerned about outsiders: “Something might happen if outsiders start coming around.”

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting

Of the 31 respondents, 22 actively hunt. The participants were asked to indicate whether or not the route options will affect their hunting areas. The majority of those that actively hunt either moose, caribou or small game, feel as though that the route options will not affect their hunting areas (9 think that it will not affect the moose hunt area; 6 think it will not affect the caribou hunt area; 10 think it will not affect the small game hunt area).

The participants were asked to provide comments on what impacts may occur during the construction and operation phases of the project. According to the participants that answered the impact questions, 13 believe that the impacts will occur during construction. The majority of the 13 have just said ‘yes,’ leaving no variations in comments. However, those that did provide comments have said:

- “During construction machinery in area.” (BV25)
- “During this time we have to monitory construction.” (BV29)

In terms of the operation phase, 15 have responded by indicating that they do believe impacts will occur during the operation phase. Such concerns include:

- “(Fuel spills, traffic) Will be affected.” (BV1)
- “Yes, there are going to be accidents.” (BV20)
- “Something might happen if outsiders start coming around.” (BV29)

In addition to indicating whether or not the route option will affect their moose, caribou or hunting areas, the participants were asked to fill out a check box of all the impacts which they think may occur during the construction or operation phases of the project. It is apparent that there is a lot of concern for: new hunting areas for the community to explore, as well as increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in fewer animals to hunt. Table A6-11 demonstrates what the participants think some impacts may be.

Table A6 - 11: Bloodvein - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to hunt	12
More amount of animals to hunt	2
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to hunt	11
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to hunt	14
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	9
New access to hunting areas for others to use	11
New hunting areas for the community to explore	16
In-migration of new or more animals resulting in more animals to hunt	2
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	16
Increased participation / interest in hunting	12

Other concerns expressed by the respondents that were not listed in the impact table included: poaching; animals migrating else where; noise; and outsiders entering the community.

Along with providing input on the suggested impacts the route options may impose, the participants were asked to check off the mitigations which they feel should be implemented. Table A6-12 below demonstrates the suggested mitigation measures the project should take. It is noted that the respondents feel that the road should be patrolled and that the road should be constructed in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 12: Bloodvein - Respondents Suggested Mitigation Measures to Reduce Impacts to Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	19
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	15
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	16
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	16
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	17

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting Birds

Of the 31 participants, 29 have indicated that they actively hunt birds. For those that actively hunt birds, 18 have responded “No” when asked if the route options will affect bird hunting in any of the areas, while 7 respondents said that their hunting areas will be affected.

Respondents were given the opportunity to express their concerns and provide comments on the route options. There were not many comments regarding the construction and operation phases. Of the 31 respondents, 11 have indicated that they think there will be impacts during construction. Those that expressed their concerns have said:

- “Possible contamination.” (BV20)
- “During the construction machinery and gravel.” (BV25)
- “Depends if they have an oil spill.” (BV29)

For the operation phase, 8 people think that impacts will occur during this time. There was no indication of what their concerns are during the operation phase. However, it was suggested by BV29 to “look after the land.”

There were, however, some concerns presented by the participants when they were asked to share other thoughts and comments with the project team. Based on the comments, respondents - BV1, BV4, and BV 31 - have some environmental concerns, such as fuel / oil spills; noise; traffic; camp sites; and target shooting.

Along with their comments regarding the impacts during the construction and operation phases, participants were asked to fill out a check box of other effects that may occur in the general vicinity of their hunting areas. Table A6-13 below illustrates the number of times the suggested impact was checked off, meaning that the participants agree with those effects occurring. Based on the information below, the participants seem to be concerned with new access to hunting areas for the community to explore.

Table A6 - 13: Bloodvein - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Bird Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	8
More amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	3
Disrupted migration of birds and waterfowl leading to less amount of animals to hunt	9
Habitat destruction leading to less birds and waterfowl to hunt	11
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	9
New access to hunting areas for others to use	11
New hunting areas for the community to explore	17
In-migration of new or more birds and waterfowl resulting in more animals to hunt	4
Increased accidents between road users and birds and waterfowl resulting in less to birds and waterfowl to hunt (fatalities)	9
Increased participation / interest in hunting	10

Along with the impact chart for the participants to fill out, they were also asked to fill out a similar chart, indicating the suggested mitigation measures. Table A6-14 below demonstrates what the participants think the mitigation measures should be. The majority of the respondents are in favour for patrolling the road.

Table A6 - 14: Bloodvein - Respondents Suggested Mitigation Measures to Reduce Impacts to Bird Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	18
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	14
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	15
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	15
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	18

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Fishing

Of the 31 participants, 28 have indicated that they actively fish. Of those that actively fish, 8 had indicated that the spawning areas will not be affected. The concerns of these respondents were focused on water contamination. For instance, BV1 and BV31 state, “yes, fish will travel through possible contaminated water source”; or as BV14 says, “Yes, when build bridges the metal will rust and slime build up plus you’ll never know what they throw in the water.” The majority of the respondents (19) believe that the spawning areas will not be affected.

The participants were given the opportunity to provide their input on what they think the impacts will be during the construction and operation phases. It appears that 11 of the respondents feel that there will be impacts on fishing areas during the construction phase. Those that provided a reason have expressed a concern for contamination (BV20 and BV29).

As for comments regarding the operation phase of the project, 7 participants have replied, indicating there may be effects during the operation phase. There were not

many comments provided, however, those respondents that were expressed concern for pollution and outsiders entering the community said:

- “Garbage (cans; plastic) thrown away by road users on highway.” (BV20)
- “Keep track of people coming in to our territory.” (BV29)

When given the opportunity to provide other thoughts or comments regarding fishing, the respondents were concerned about pollution; fish migration; traffic; and contamination.

With respect to other effects which they think will occur, participants were given a check box to fill to indicate which other effects they think the new road will bring. According to the participants, the main impacts that will occur in the vicinity of the fishing areas are: potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals; new fishing areas for the community to explore; new fishing areas for others to utilize; and increased participation.

Table A6 - 15: Bloodvein - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Fishing Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less fish	4
More fish	1
Disrupted migration of animals preying on fish which leads to larger amount of fish to hunt	5
Habitat destruction leading to less fish species to hunt	7
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less fishing	8
New access to fishing area for others to use	10
New fishing areas for the community to explore	12
In-migration of new animals resulting in less fish.	5
Potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals you hunt / trap	14
Increased participation / interest in fishing	10

Along with the perceived impacts the route options may pose, participants were asked to indicate what their suggested mitigation measures would be. Table A6-16 below

illustrates what mitigation measures the people want implemented. According to the respondents, the top three mitigation measures are: provide road patrolling; ensure that road construction and operation are implemented in an environmentally sound way; and implement legislation.

Table A6 - 16: Bloodvein - Respondents Suggested Mitigation Measures to Reduce Impacts to Fishing Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	19
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	16
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	15
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	14
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	19

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Spawning

Knowledge of spawning is important to the MBR Project as it may assist in localizing how sensitive areas are and therefore minimizing impacts. Out of the 31 respondents, 10 participants indicated knowledge of spawning areas and which types of fish spawn.

Those who did know of spawning responded by stating: a) fish types; and b) traditional spawning activity. Fish types include: sturgeon; pickerel; jackfish; suckers; and mullet. According to the respondents, these fish with spawn in most rapids and falls of Bloodvein River, or up the river, or in shallow waters. For instance:

- “Most rapids and falls of Bloodvein River.” (BV1)
- “Way up the river – Sturgeon falls area.” (BV2)
- “Yes – Anywhere – Shallow Waters.” (BV14)
- “Yes – Lake Winnipeg River. Early spring rapids. Grass areas close to shore.” (BV16)

See Appendix 6.2 for full list of comments.

General Wildlife

With respect to the wildlife, majority of the participants have indicated that they know where there are lynx, wolves, bears and other predator animals. Of the 31 respondents, 14 have indicated they know where lynx are; 17 respondents have shown they know of wolves; and 22 have stated they know where bears are. According to the participants, there are other predator animals to be aware of, including: fox, fisher, marten, coyotes, raccoons, eagles, otters, beavers, muskrats, and weasels.

When asked if the road will affect predator routes, only 10 of the 31 participants responded yes. The majority of these participants did not provide any reason as to why they believe the road may affect predator travel routes. However, those that did provide reasons said the following:

- “Just bears.” (BV11)
- “Yes more at winter.” (BV13)
- “Might be more because of the salt use of the roads.” (BV29)

Participants were also asked if they know of any eagle, hawk, osprey, falcon, owl, heron, and other bird nests. Of the 31 participants, 21 indicated that they know of these animals.

Furthermore, the participants were asked if they know of any effects that may occur on the existing environment. Only 8 people of the 31 have expressed concerns regarding the effects on the existing environment. Such concerns include:

- “Disrupting.” (BV1)
- “Yes, in a couple there will be cabins along the shore of Lake Winnipeg.” (BV8)
- “Yes less existence animals.” (BV18)
- “If water is affected every living thing will be affected.” (BV20)
- “We have to protect our own land and not let too many people in. People would need First Nations approval.” (BV29)

The rest of the respondents answered “No” to the question as they think there are no impacts on the existing environment. Some of the responses were:

- “Not that much effect on the environment.” (BV25)
- “I don’t think it will affect anything.” (BV28)

Finally, respondents were asked to provide some input on what problems the Project should be aware of. Of the 31 participants, 15 provided their thoughts on the issue. According to the majority of the answers, there seems to be concern with: alcohol and

drug abuse, criminal activity, poachers, increased amounts of accidents, and environmental impacts.

- “Criminal activity (pouching). Drug and alcohol trafficking; auto theft. More gang related activity.” (BV1)
- “Sneaking in illicit drugs (meth; etc)” (BV2)
- “Less birds because of pouchers. Environmental effect, like spills (toxic/chemical) logging regulation.” (BV4)
- “Accident (car accidents).” (BV10)
- “They won’t have much to eat. Because they’ll kill the trees and vegetation.” (BV14)
- “Alcoholics, dupe addicts this is not a dry reserve.” (BV17)
- “Oil spills gas spills protect from these things.” (BV29)

For detailed list of all comments regarding the general wildlife, see Appendix 6.2.

Cultural Areas

Participants were asked to answer questions regarding various cultural areas including burial and historical grounds; medicinal areas; berry gathering; and other areas. The respondents were asked to check off either “yes”, “no” or “not in the area”. Of the 31 respondents, 13 have indicated that they know of burial grounds and historical settlement/camps in the area. 14 of the participants have indicated that they know of medicinal areas. While 23 of the respondents have indicated they know of berry gathering areas. Only 7 participants knew of other areas to avoid.

When asked if there are other areas to avoid, 20 of the 31 participants replied ‘No.’ However, those that did reply with yes regarding other areas to avoid said the reason for avoiding such areas were for: burial grounds, medicinal areas and berry gathering areas, especially areas along the river.

When asked about if whether or not they believe the new road will affect their access or access by others to their areas of interest/traditional lands, 7 participants replied with yes and provided reason as to why they are concerned with the new affects that the road will bring. According to the respondents, concerns were:

- “Yes, hunting grounds. Desecration of traditional/cultural grounds.” (BV1)
- “Yes, disadvantages construction activities, archaeologists (artifacts) that belong to us First Nations.” (BV4)
- “People building the road will waste lots of trees. First Nations use trees for firewood and to build cabins they take only what they need.” (BV20)

Others have expressed their interest in the road as it may be beneficial to them. Such positive comments include:

- “If there is a road it will be nice.” (BV5)
- “No. (Good for the store. Go shopping down south.” (BV8)
- “Beneficial, don’t have to travel the lake in bad weather.” (BV24)
- “Good for travelling don’t have to worry about bad weather. Nothing bad will come of it.” (BV29)

Lastly, participants were given the chance to give any other information they would like to share with the project team that will aid in understanding how the road may affect them, their community and surrounding environment. The majority of the participants provided their opinion and comments, such as:

- “Keep is young people clean; away from gang life.” (BV2)
- “Easy access to destination and other resources, medical shopping, and family.” (BV4)
- “Sometimes it will help people to get out. Easier to travel by road instead of plane or boat.” (BV5)
- “Big advantage, and to go visiting relatives, shopping out at a town. Advantage to take patients for their appointments in Winnipeg like a day trip.” (BV7)
- “Like the road construction air fare and rip are too expensive. Medical will be very helpful for a day trip. Go shopping easy access. More road use for drivers on the highway.” (BV16)
- “We’ll have supplies with easier access and plus their might be more jobs for people. Land title office will that there is a reserve in the Loon Straits area.” (BV17)

In contrast with these positive comments are opinions provided by the participants that are concerned with the new road in general. For instance, respondents are concerned with outsiders entering the community, as well as protecting their land. Such issues that were raised include:

- “Not really agree about ‘all-season road.’ Wishes the chief/councillors to think of a plan to prevent trouble and accidents from happening.” (BV9)
- “They were supposed to explain the whole story as to what they are going to do. So everybody will know what they are doing. In winter it will be dangerous for auto thefts and vehicles breaking down in the winter. White people are going to destroy all medicines when they build the road. Good for

travelling for cheaper groceries and emergencies will be quickly transported.” (BV20)

- “More people from other places will come in and kill animals. We need people from here to look after the territory. I don’t want just anybody to come in and kill anything. We have to be satisfied to travel freely.” (BV29)

For a full list of comments regarding cultural areas, see Appendix 6.2.

6.3.3 Berens River

Trapping

Berens River had 37 participants. Of the 37 participants, 12 have indicated that they actively trap. When asked whether or not any of the route options will affect their traplines, 29 had no answer to provide; 3 have indicated that there will be no affects; while 1 individual responded yes. The remaining respondents gave their opinions by stating:

- “Depends where the road is coming from.” (BR1)
- “Somewhat – time will tell. Be easier to travel.” (BR3)
- “Easier to get there.” (BR4)
- “I don’t know – I guess it will depend if the road goes by my trapline.” (BR10)
- “Maybe not for long.” (BR16)
- “No – but easier.” (BR17)

Furthermore, another effects question was asked about whether or not the road will make it harder for the trappers to get the same number of animals. Of the 37 respondents, 9 have said that the road will not affect their traplines; for instance, respondent BR18 states, “No – because the road is there – no more real isolation. No real challenge to get there.” Of the 37 participants only 1 person indicated that the road will indeed make it harder to obtain the same number of animals

In addition to providing their input and their concerns with the route options, the respondents were asked to check off other impacts which they think may affect the road. Table A6-17 below demonstrates how many respondents agree that the suggested impact may occur in the area due to the road.

Table A6 - 17: Berens River - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Trapping Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to trap	2
More animals to trap	3
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to trap	3
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to trap	1
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping	2
New access to trap lines for others to use	6
New hunting area for the community to explore	6
New or more animals resulting in more animals to trap	4
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	3
Increased participation / interest in trapping	1

Unfortunately, the majority of the participants did not respond to this question by not indicating what impacts they think may occur. Most of these charts by the respondents were left blank. However, of the 37 participants, 12 have indicated what they believe the impacts will be. According to the respondents, the major impacts that may occur are: new access to trap lines for others to use, as well as a new hunting area for the community to explore. Some respondents also indicated some concerns of theirs that were not listed on the impact chart. Their concerns were generally of the same idea, regarding other people disturbing the area; for instance:

- “Garbage, poachers.” (BR36)
- “Poachers.” (BR37)

In addition to the impacts which the respondents think may occur, they were also given the opportunity to check off the suggested mitigation measures. It appears that the most suggested mitigation is to ensure that the road construction and operation is implemented in an environmentally responsible way. Table A6-18 below demonstrates how many people suggested what the mitigation measures should be:

Table A6 - 18: Berens River – Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts to Trapping Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	1
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	1
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	2
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	3
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	12

When asked about when the impacts will occur, either during construction or operation, as well as to provide other comments or opinions, most of the respondents were concerned about the construction activities. Unfortunately, there is no variation in the comments regarding the activities that will take place during construction. Of the 37 respondents, 10 replied indicating that the impacts will occur during the construction phase.

With respect to the operation phase, only one individual responded and expressed concern: “Pollution + garbage by the road side. Dirty ditches lead to creeks than to rivers. The earth can’t filter everything.” (BR18) When asked to provide other comments and concerns, the same respondent provided his/her comment regarding the operation phase, expressing a concern for maintaining the cleanliness of the road, by stating: “When the road is finished, who’s going to keep the road side clean.” (BR18)

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting

Of the 37 respondents, 15 actively hunt. The respondents were asked whether or not the route options will affect their hunting areas. Of those that actively hunt either moose, caribou or small game 9 respondents think that the road will not affect the moose hunt area; 1 respondent thinks it will not affect the caribou hunt area; 1 respondent thinks it will not affect the small game hunt area. The aforementioned statistics are small, as the majority of the participants have not provided any answer (26 did not provide an answer regarding the moose hunt area; 36 did not provide an answer for the caribou hunt area; and 35 did not respond to the small game hunt area.)

The participants were asked to provide comments on what impacts may occur during the construction and operation phases of the project. Of the participants that answered the impact questions, 9 believe that the impacts will occur during construction.

In terms of the operation phase, only two have responded to this question – one has said that there will be no impacts during the operation phase, while the other has said yes. The respondent that responded yes has provided a concern for accidents: “More truck accidents with animals. Salt from roads will attract animals.” (BR18)

The participants were also given the chance to provide other opinions and comments. Of the 37 respondents, only 3 have provided comments; they are:

- “Finish quick.” (BR7)
- “Need road soon.” (BR21)
- “Some disruption maybe, but not much during construction and operation.” (BR22)

The remaining 34 participants unfortunately did not provide their comments or concerns.

In addition to indicating whether or not the route option will affect the moose, caribou or hunting areas, the participants were asked to fill out a check box of all the impacts which they think may occur during the construction or operation phases of the project. It is apparent that there is a lot of concern for new access to hunting areas for others to use, as well as new access to hunting areas for the community to explore. Table A6-19 demonstrates what the participants think some impacts may be.

Table A6 - 19: Berens River – Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to hunt	2
More amount of animals to hunt	2
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to hunt	0
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to hunt	1
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	2
New access to hunting areas for others to use	12
New hunting areas for the community to explore	10
In-migration of new or more animals resulting in more animals to hunt	3
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	3
Increased participation / interest in hunting	2

Along with the suggested impacts the route options may impose, the participants were asked to check off the mitigations which they feel should be implemented. Table A6-20 below demonstrates the suggested mitigation measures the project should take. This table shows that the respondents feel that the road should be constructed in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 20: Berens River - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts to Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	4
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	2
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	3
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	3
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	15

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting Birds

Of the 37 participants, 10 have indicated that they actively hunt birds. For those that actively hunt birds, 6 have responded “No” when asked if the route options will affect bird hunting in any of the areas, while none of the respondents have said “Yes.”

Respondents were given the opportunity to express their concerns and provide comments on the route options. Unfortunately the participants of Berens River did not provide any comments regarding the hunting waterfowl areas; 31 out of the 37 respondents did not provide any answer. However, of the 6 that did 5 agreed that there will be impacts during the construction phase, while the remaining one has indicated that there will be no impacts.

Similar to that of the construction comments, the operation phase comments are dismal. Of the 37 participants, 35 did not provide any answer or indication of whether or not impacts will occur during the operation phase. The two respondents that did provide an answer either said “none” (BR21) or “some” (BR22).

Along with their comments regarding the impacts during the construction and operation phases, participants were asked to fill out a check box of other effects that may occur in the general vicinity of their hunting areas. Table A6-21 below illustrates the number of times the suggested impact was checked off, meaning that the participants agree with

those effects occurring. Based on the information below, the participants seem to be concerned with new access to hunting areas for others to use.

Table A6 - 21: Berens River - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Bird Hunting Activity

Potential Effect	Number of supporting answers
Less amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	0
More amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	3
Disrupted migration of birds and waterfowl leading to less amount of animals to hunt	0
Habitat destruction leading to less birds and waterfowl to hunt	1
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	0
New access to hunting areas for others to use	6
New hunting areas for the community to explore	5
In-migration of new or more birds and waterfowl resulting in more animals to hunt	0
Increased accidents between road users and birds and waterfowl resulting in less to birds and waterfowl to hunt (fatalities)	1
Increased participation / interest in hunting	2

Along with the impact chart for the participants to fill out, they were also asked to fill out a similar chart, indicating the suggested mitigation measures. Table A6-22 below demonstrates what the participants think the mitigation measures should be. The majority of the respondents indicated that the road should be constructed in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 22: Berens River - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts to Bird Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	2
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	1
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	2
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	2
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	11

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Fishing

Of the 37 participants, 28 have indicated that they actively fish. Of those that actively fish, 2 do not think that any of the route options will affect fishing spawn areas, while 35 of 37 respondents did not provide any answer.

The participants were given the opportunity to provide their input on what they think the impacts will be during the construction and operation phases. It appears that 19 of the respondents feel that there will be impacts on fishing areas during the construction phase. Of the ones that indicated there will be impacts during construction activities, only one respondent expressed his/her concerns: “Construction close to the river. Run off that lead to creek goes down to the rivers somehow, that poison the fish OR some kind of mutation happens.” (BR19)

As for comments regarding the operation phase of the project, only one (BR22) has responded by saying that there will be “some” impacts during the operation phase.

When given the opportunity to provide other thoughts or comments regarding fishing, 36 of the respondents did not provide any answer. The only answer that was given was “none” by BR21.

With respect to other effects which they think will occur, participants were given a check box to fill, by indicating which other effects they think the new road will bring. According to the participants, the main impacts that will occur in the vicinity of the fishing areas are: new fishing areas for the community to explore; new access to fishing area for others to use; and potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals.

Table A6 - 23: Berens River - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Fishing Activity

Potential Effect	Number of supporting answers
Less fish	3
More fish	1
Disrupted migration of animals preying on fish which leads to larger amount of fish to hunt	3
Habitat destruction leading to less fish species to hunt	6
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less fishing	3
New access to fishing area for others to use	15
New fishing areas for the community to explore	16
In-migration of new animals resulting in less fish.	0
Potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals you hunt / trap	13
Increased participation / interest in fishing	1

Along with the perceived impacts the route options may pose, participants were asked to indicate what their suggested mitigation measures would be. Table A6-24 below illustrates what mitigation measures the people want implemented. According to the respondents, the main mitigation measure that should be considered is to ensure that road construction and operation is implemented in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 24: Berens River - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Fishing Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	2
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	3
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	3
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	3
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	22

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Spawning

Knowledge of spawning is important to the MBR Project as it may assist in localizing how sensitive areas are and therefore minimizing impacts. Out of the 37 respondents, 2 have replied by saying 'yes' to the question of if they know of any spawning areas. Unfortunately, the rest of the respondents did not provide any answer. These two respondents have shared their information about what types of fish they know spawn; these include: red suckers, sturgeon and pickerel.

See Appendix 6.2 for full list of comments.

General Wildlife

With respect to the wildlife, majority of the participants have indicated that they know where there are lynx, wolves, bears and other predator animals. Of the 37 respondents, 4 have indicated they know where lynx are; 3 respondents have shown they know of wolves; and 5 have stated they know where bears are.

The participants were then prompted to answer whether or not they think the road will affect predator travel routes. Unfortunately the participants did not have an answer to this question; rather, 3 participants have replied 'no' to this question.

Participants were also asked if they know of any eagle, hawk, osprey, flacon, owl, herron, and other bird nests. Of the 37 participants, 4 indicated that they know of these animals.

Furthermore, the participants were questioned if they know of any affects that may occur on the existing environment. Only 3 of the 37 respondents responded with a 'no' while the remaining 34 did not provide any answer.

Finally, respondents were asked to provide some input on what problems the Project should be aware of. Of the 37 participants, 2 provided their concerns on the issue. Such concerns were:

- "Immigrants." (BR21)
- "More drugs / regulations / hunting." (BR36)

For detailed list of all comments regarding the general wildlife, see Appendix 6.2.

Cultural Areas

Participants were asked to answer questions regarding various cultural areas including burial and historical grounds; medicinal areas; berry gathering; and other areas. The respondents were asked to check off either "yes", "no" or "not in the area". Of the 37

respondents, 13 have indicated that they know of burial grounds and historical settlement/camps in the area; 9 have indicated that they know of medicinal areas; 11 of the respondents have indicated they know of berry gathering areas. None of the participants indicated if there are other areas to avoid. However, the participants seem to be concerned for avoiding other areas due to grave sites that are located within the communities. Those that mentioned of reasons to avoid other special areas have said:

- “Grave sites. Along Berens River – North Branch.” (BR1)
- “Grave / spiritual sites. Along Berens River to Little Grand not sure where.” (BR8)
- “Grave sites along Berens River – Pigeon. But not sure where.” (BR13)

When asked about whether or not they believe the new road will affect their access or access by others to their areas of interest/traditional lands, 4 participants replied with yes and provide reason as to why they are concerned with the new effects that the road will bring. According to the respondents, there will be benefits as a result of the road construction, such as lower freight costs:

- “Yes. Food and groceries hope it will be cheaper.” (BR1)
- “Yes – cheaper food – freight. Don’t have to rely on planes. Disadvantage – bootlegger – drug dealers.” (BR7)

In contrast to these comments, 8 of the 37 participants have replied to this question with a ‘no’. The remaining participants merely did not provide an answer.

Lastly, participants were given the chance to give any other information they would like to share with the project team that will aid in understanding how the road may affect them, their community and surrounding environment. Of the 37 participants, 20 have provided a negative answer, indicating that they do not have any other issues or concerns to bring to the Project’s attention. Only two people provided their opinions and concerns, such as:

- “No, not much. Make sure RCMP drives the roads more often.” (BR1)
- “Lost lands (loosing land). More outside hunters, fishermen, trappers, etc.” (BR21)

The remaining respondents did not provide any comments or concerns when asked this question.

For a full list of comments regarding cultural areas, see Appendix 6.2.

6.3.4 Pauingassi

Trapping

The community of Pauingassi had the least amount of participants consisting of 20 individuals. Of the 20 participants, 14 actively trap. When asked whether any of the route options affect their traplines, 14 answered “No”, 4 replied “yes”, 1 was unsure and 1 did not provide any answer. Those that answered ‘yes’ have indicated that the reason the road will affect their trapline is that it will go through their trapping area (i.e.: PAU5, PAU12, PAU20).

Moreover, participants were prompted to answer another effects question regarding the difficulty of trapping the same number of animals with the road options. The majority of the participants (13) said “Yes”, indicating that it will make it harder for them to trap the same number of animals, while 7 respondents said “No.”

In addition to providing their input and their concerns with the route options, the respondents were asked to check off other impacts which they think may the road will have. Table A6-25 below demonstrates how many respondents agree that the suggested impact may occur in the area due to the road.

Table A6 - 25: Pauingassi - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Trapping Activity

Potential Effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to trap	15
More animals to trap	1
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to trap	13
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to trap	1
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping	0
New access to trap lines for others to use	15
New hunting area for the community to explore	3
New or more animals resulting in more animals to trap	0
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	1
Increased participation / interest in trapping	2

It appears that the majority of the respondents believe that the major impacts that will occur will be: less animals to trap; new access to trap lines for others to use; and disrupted migration of animals leading to fewer animals to trap. One respondent also indicated some concerns that were not listed on the impact chart. His/her concern is regarding accidents that could harm road users and/or animals:

- “If too many or too often accidents between road users and the animals might scare away the animals.” (PAU7)

In addition to the impacts which the respondents think may occur, they were also given the opportunity to check off the suggested mitigation measures. It appears that the most suggested mitigation is to provide road patrolling. Table A6-26 below demonstrates how many people suggested what the mitigation measures should be:

Table A6 - 26: Pauingassi - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Trapping Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	18
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	17
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	1
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	17
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	13

When asked about when the impacts will occur, either during construction or operation, as well as to provide other comments or opinions, all of the respondents were concerned about construction activities with respect to the clearing process and the equipment being utilized, that animals will migrate elsewhere. The comments were as follows:

- “When construction take place it will scare away the wild life.” (PAU1)
- “When clearing the route way with the heavy equipment. Blasting the rocky area’s.” (PAU2)
- “Pushing trees, clearing the route way with huge equipment. Blasting rocky area.” (PAU8)
- “Impact will occur when they start building the road.” (PAU17)

In terms of the operation phase, 18 of the 20 participants were not concerned with the impacts. According to these participants, there will be fewer impacts once the road is completed.

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting

Based on the surveys, all of the participants actively hunt. The participants were asked to indicate whether or not the route options will affect their hunting areas. The majority of those that actively hunt either moose, caribou or small game, feel as though that the route options will affect their hunting areas (14 said the route options will affect their moose hunt area; 12 said the route options will affect their caribou hunt area; 14 said the route options will affect their small game hunt area).

The participants were asked to provide comments on what impacts may occur during the construction and operation phases of the project. According to the comments that were provided, respondents are concerned with the animals relocating due to the construction activities. Another concern the respondents have is the clearing process of the route way that involves heavy machinery. Such comments that were made regarding the aforementioned issues are:

- “During construction animals will be scared away.” (PAU1)
- “Yes animals will move away when construction takes place.” (PAU6)
- “When clearing the way with the equipment.” (PAU7)
- “Bull dozer when clearing the route way. Blasting the rocky area’s.” (PAU12)
- “Heavy equipment usage. Blasting the area.” (PAU15)

In addition to indicating whether or not the route option will affect their moose, caribou or hunting areas, the participants were asked to fill out a check box of all the impacts which they think may occur during the construction or operation phases of the project. It is apparent that there is a lot of concern for new access to hunting areas for others to use, as well as less animals to trap. Table A6-27 demonstrates what the participants think some impacts may be.

Table A6 - 27: Pauingassi - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Potential Effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to hunt	19
More amount of animals to hunt	0
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to hunt	16
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to hunt	2
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	0
New access to hunting areas for others to use	15
New hunting areas for the community to explore	5
In-migration of new or more animals resulting in more animals to hunt	0
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	0
Increased participation / interest in hunting	0

Along with the suggested impacts the route options may cause, the participants were asked to check off the mitigations which they feel should be implemented. Table A6-28 below demonstrates the suggested mitigation measures the project should take. According to the respondents concerns, the respondents feel that the road should be patrolled, and road uses should be controlled by establishing control point office along the road way.

Table A6 - 28: Pauingassi - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	19
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	20
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	1
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	20
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	16

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting Birds

Of the 20 participants, 19 have indicated that they actively hunt birds. For those that actively hunt birds, 8 have responded “No” when asked if the route options will affect bird hunting in any of the areas, while 10 have responded “Yes.”

Respondents were given the opportunity to express their concerns and provide comments on the route options. Similar to that of trapping and hunting, the participants believe that most of the impacts will occur during the construction phase; while there will be fewer impacts during the operation phase. Comments regarding the construction activities pertain to the use of equipment, the animals relocating, and the clearing process of the route way. Such comments that were provided are as follows:

- “Might scare away the animals.” (PAU1)
- “Using the huge equipment when clearing the route way. Blasting.” (PAU2)
- “Blasting, clearing trees with bull dozer.” (PAU13)
- “When heavy equipment destroys the common grounds for animals and the nesting area’s for the birds.” (PAU16)

Along with their comments regarding the impacts during the construction and operation phases, participants were asked to fill out a check box of other effects that may occur in the general vicinity of their hunting areas. Table A6-29 below illustrates the number of

times the suggested impact was checked off, meaning that the number of participants that agree with those effects occurring. Based on the information below, the participants seem to be concerned with new access to hunting areas for others to use, and new hunting areas for the community to explore.

Table A6 - 29: Pauingassi - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Bird Hunting Activity

Potential Effect	Number of supporting answers
Less amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	17
More amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	0
Disrupted migration of birds and waterfowl leading to less amount of animals to hunt	13
Habitat destruction leading to less birds and waterfowl to hunt	2
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	0
New access to hunting areas for others to use	17
New hunting areas for the community to explore	5
In-migration of new or more birds and waterfowl resulting in more animals to hunt	0
Increased accidents between road users and birds and waterfowl resulting in less to birds and waterfowl to hunt (fatalities)	1
Increased participation / interest in hunting	0

Along with the impact chart for the participants to fill out, they were also asked to fill out a similar chart, indicating the suggested mitigation measures. Table A6-30 below demonstrates what the participants think the mitigation measures should be. The majority of the respondents indicated that the road construction and operation should be implemented in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 30: Pauingassi - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Bird Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	18
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	18
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	1
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	19
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	15

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Fishing

Of the 20 participants, 19 have indicated that they actively fish. Of those that actively fish, 16 have indicated that the spawning areas will be affected. Participants feel as though the fish will not spawn as much, as they may relocate to another area. For instance, respondents have said:

- “What can happen is fish will move to another area.” (PAU4)
- “If route option destroys spawning area, then likely the fish will move to another area.” (PAU5)

The participants were given the opportunity to provide their input on what they think the impacts will be during the construction and operation phases. Based on the surveys, the comments given by the respondents were of the same nature as they had a common concern for if there will be bridges built over the rivers, as it may result in the fishing relocating to another area. Example of these comments are as follows:

- “Major impact will happen when bridging the rivers, streams.” (PAU3)
- “Fish will move when construction takes place.” (PAU6)
- “When building bridges on rivers, streams. Huge equipment use. Blasting.” (PAU8)
- “When building bridge’s on rivers, streams. Fish disturbance will occur when work is done on rivers, stream.” (PAU20)

As for comments regarding the operation phase of the project, all of the respondents share the same opinion that there will be less impact during the operation phase of the Project. Such comments are:

- “Once the road is finished it shouldn’t affect the spawning that much.” (PAU1)
- “Impact should be less. Less disturbance.” (PAU7)
- “Once road is completed less impact will occur.” (PAU20)

With respect to other effects which they think will occur, participants were given a check box to fill to indicate which other effects they think the new road will bring. According to the participants, the main impacts that will occur in the vicinity of the fishing areas are: new access to fishing areas for others to use, as well as less fish.

Table A6 - 31: Pauingassi - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Fishing Activity

Potential Effect	Number of supporting answers
Less fish	17
More fish	0
Disrupted migration of animals preying on fish which leads to larger amount of fish to hunt	13
Habitat destruction leading to less fish species to hunt	3
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less fishing	0
New access to fishing area for others to use	19
New fishing areas for the community to explore	5
In-migration of new animals resulting in less fish.	0
Potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals you hunt / trap	1
Increased participation / interest in fishing	0

Along with the perceived impacts the route options may pose, participants were asked to indicate what their suggested mitigation measures would be. The table below illustrates what mitigation measures the people want implemented. According to the respondents,

the top three mitigation measures are: control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way; provide road patrolling; and road block.

Table A6 - 32: Pauingassi - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Fishing Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	18
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	19
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	0
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	19
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	15

Spawning

Knowledge of spawning is important to the MBR Project as it may assist in localizing the sensitive areas and therefore minimizing impacts. Out of the 20 respondents, 14 answered this question; 14 participants indicated knowledge of spawning areas, while 7 seem to know which types of fish spawn.

Those who did know of spawning responded by stating a) fish types; and b) traditional spawning activity. Fish types include: jackfish, white, walleye, perch, sucker, tullibee, and trout. According to the respondents, these fish spawn in waterfalls or rapids. For instance:

- “Fish usually spawn near the water falls.” (PAU4)
- “For our area most of the fish spawn in the spring near the rapids.” (PAU6)

See Appendix 6.2 for full list of comments.

General Wildlife

With respect to the wildlife, all of the respondents have indicated that they know where there are lynx, wolves, bears and other predator animals. There are no other predator animals that these participants know of in the area. When asked if the road will affect predator routes, 18 of the 20 participants explicitly responded ‘yes.’ The other two respondents that did not provide a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer stated:

- “Some animals might move to different area.” (PAU1)
- “Can be anywhere.” (PAU6)

Participants were also asked if they know of any eagle, hawk, osprey, falcon, owl, heron, and other bird nests. All of the participants replied to this question by explicitly stating ‘yes’ on the surveys. However, one respondent, PAU10, said yes and indicated that he/she know of eagles in the area.

Furthermore, the participants were asked if they know of any effects that may occur on the existing environment. The respondents all shared a common concern for the nesting areas of the animals as well as the common grounds of other animals. Such comments are:

- “Construction will destroy common grounds for the animals, birds.” (PAU2)
- “It will destroy nesting territory for some birds.” (PAU11)
- “It will destroy trees, ground and the animals will move.” (PAU16)

Finally, respondents were asked to provide some input on what problems the Project should be aware of. Of the 20 respondents, 18 provided their thoughts on the issue. According to the majority of the answers, there seems to be concern with the bird nesting areas, trees and water, as mentioned below:

- “Animals, birds will move to relocate.” (PAU7)
- “Certainly it will affect animals, trees, water.” (PAU10)
- “Animals, birds will move to different area, once their common grounds are destroyed.” (PAU20)

For detailed list of all comments regarding the general wildlife, see Appendix 6.2.

Cultural Areas

Participants were asked to answer questions regarding various cultural areas including burial and historical grounds; medicinal areas; berry gathering; and other areas. The respondents were asked to check off either “yes”, “no” or “not in the area”. Of the 20 respondents, none of them have indicated that they know of burial grounds and historical settlement/camps in the area. For medicinal areas, only 2 of the 20 participants know of such areas. Likewise with berry gathering, only 2 know where these areas are located. In terms of knowledge of other areas to avoid, none of the respondents know of such areas, rather 17 of the 20 participants explicitly said ‘no.’

Following the knowledge of the aforementioned cultural areas, participants were prompted to answer questions regarding the effects the road will have on their access or access by others to their areas of interest/traditional lands. Of the 20 respondents, 17 replied and provided their opinions on this question. The respondents raised concerns

such as: non-Aboriginals exploring the area, as well as others accessing their traplines. These concerns were presented in comments such as:

- “Others like non aboriginal people will come to explore our traditional territory it is a great concern for me.” (PAU1)
- “Want to continue to access my trapline. Hope others won’t access my trapline.” (PAU2)
- “Would like to keep my traditional territories for my own use and future generation to come.” (PAU15)

In contrast, however, three of the respondents have replied to this question by stating that the road will not affect them or their traditional areas. For instance, respondents have stated:

- “The route option will not affect my trapline.” (PAU17)
- “It won’t affect my route to trapline.” (PAU18)
- “It won’t affect my route to access my traditional territories.” (PAU19)

Lastly, participants were given the chance to give any other information they would like to share with the project team that will aid in understanding how the road may affect them, their community and surrounding environment. The majority of the participants (19 of 20) responded by stating their opinions and concerns. To some of respondents, there seems to be concern for major developments occurring on their land. Those that raised these concerns have said:

- “Avoid huge development when the road comes through.” (PAU2)
- “If road does happen and if new development happens, then it will destroy more land.” (PAU4)
- “My concern is that new development might occur and it would destroy the traditional area.” (PAU12)
- “Once the all weather road in place avoid huge major development. Because some industries development destroys land, water and pollute’s air.” (PAU16)
- “New road, just hope it doesn’t open the non-aboriginal people to establish new development.” (PAU19)

In addition to the aforementioned concerns, positive comments were also provided:

- “Have no say on crown land, but like to see all weather road built.” (PAU1)
- “Provide workshop’s about the building the road.” (PAU11)

For a full list of comments regarding cultural areas, see Appendix 6.2.

6.3.5 Hollow Water

Trapping

Hollow Water had the highest amount of respondents with various opinions about the proposed road. Of the 30 participants, 22 actively trap. 10 answered “No” when asked whether any of the route options affect their trap lines. Respondents that gave reasons as to why the route options will not affect their trap lines mentioned that it is because the route is not in the vicinity of their trap lines:

- “No, No effect to mention.” (HW11)
- “No, Road won’t affect trap line b/c it is far away from the road.” (HW17)
- “Not worried about the way road will affect trap lines.” (HW22)

Less than half of the participants – being 13 – responded and gave an answer of “Yes” to the question of whether or not the route options will affect their trap lines. Those that were concerned said:

- “Yes, because road runs along trap line.” (HW18)
- “Yes, because the highway is approximately one kilometre from the Lake on Home Block. Therefore I am limited to trapping closest to the lake.” (HW20)
- “Yes, any change in traffic will affect the animals.” (HW21)
- “Yes, it will affect all the land.” (HW23)
- “Yes, if it is developed, it will ruin areas.” (HW24)
- “Yes, I think it will disrupt the land.” (HW27)

The remaining 7 respondents did not provide any answer about the road affecting their trap lines.

Furthermore, another effects question was asked about whether or not the road will make it harder for the trappers to get the same number of animals. The majority of the participants (16) said “No”, indicating that it will not make it harder for them to trap the same number of animals, while 11 respondents said “Yes.”

In addition to providing their input and their concerns with the route options, the respondents were asked to check off other impacts which they think the road may have. Table A6-33 below demonstrates how many respondents agree that the suggested impact may occur in the area due to the road.

Table A6 - 33: Hollow Water - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Trapping Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to trap	11
More animals to trap	6
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to trap	15
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to trap	21
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping	20
New access to trap lines for others to use	7
New hunting area for the community to explore	7
New or more animals resulting in more animals to trap	5
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to trap (fatalities)	7
Increased participation / interest in trapping	9

It appears that the majority of the respondents believe that the impacts will be habitat destruction leading to fewer animals to trap, loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping, as well as disrupted migration of animals leading to fewer number of animals to trap. Some respondents also indicated some concerns of theirs that were not listed on the impact chart. Their concerns were generally of the same idea, regarding disturbance of the area and/or trap lines; for instance:

- “More roads, various activities from the road by people.” (HW2)
- “All weather roads bring added restrictions by gov’t (DNR) for hunting area. Area decreased due to road development, erosion of Treaty Rights to hunt due to loss of hunting territory. ” (HW3)
- “Road may have some effect on migration of animals, moose, deer.” (HW7)
- “Easier access to hunt at will while travelling in territory.” (HW8)
- “To stop poachers, need to educate on moose hunting protocols.” (HW9)
- “Yes because we will have to go further into the bush. Cost will go up because we will need to buy transportation, skidoo etc.” (HW18)

- “Making more roads for access, loggers, cottages. More pollution on Lakes and Wild Rice area.” (HW19)
- “The increase in traffic will result in decrease of animals heading towards the east shore.” (H20)
- “Water contamination from more use of chemicals in the area. Break in food chain.” (H21)
- “More hunters on road anytime of the year.” (HW24)
- “Co management” (HW25)
- “Need our NROs to be trained” (HW30)

In addition to the impacts the respondents think may occur, they were also given the opportunity to check off the suggested mitigation measures. It appears that the most suggested mitigation is to ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmentally responsible way. Table A6-34 below demonstrates how many people suggested what the mitigation measures should be:

Table A6 - 34: Hollow Water - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Trapping Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	5
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	10
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	9
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	8
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	12

When asked about when the impacts will occur, either during construction or operation, as well as to provide other comments or opinions, most of the respondents were concerned about the noise during construction. The comments were as follows:

- “Throughout development into years to come, wildlife moving out of territory, a break in food chain link.” (HW3)
- “Government Guideline may affect and take away trap line boundary.” (HW7)

- “To stop poachers. Need to educate on moose hunting protocols.” (HW9)
- “Clearing right of way to build.” (HW14)
- “Winter, especially logging and making roads. Blocking streams, rivers without culverts.” (HW19)
- “With any construction at all, it will deplete animal activity.” (HW20)
- “I think it will bother the land when constructing.” (HW22)
- “Yes, it will impact everything.” (HW27)

Not many of the participants were too concerned about the impacts happening during the operation phase. Those that were concerned were afraid of logging, mining, cottage development (HW10, HW21 and HW30); spraying of the land with chemicals that will kill animals and affect humans who consume animals (HW18); change everything like wildlife (HW3 and HW28); and after the road is completed, every one will be there, hunters, loggers (HW24). HW3 commented that “a break in food chain link cannot be established or fixed in a year, all animals, plants, and insects interdependence require a length of time in years to regenerate to depend on each other.”

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting

Of the 30 respondents, 22 actively hunt. The participants were asked to indicate whether or not the route options will affect hunting. Ten of those that actively hunt either moose, caribou or small game, feel as though that the route options will not affect their moose hunting areas; 3 think it will not affect the caribou hunting area; and 8 think it will not affect small game hunting area.

The participants were asked to provide comments on what impacts may occur during the construction and operation phases of the project. Based on the comments that were provided, logging, mining, cottage development and forestry operation and increased traffic seem to be the main concern that the participants have as these “will result in disruption of migratory patterns”. “Road construction and any other development on traditional territory the road will now open to. After road development comes other gov’t and industrial development” (HW3). “Disrupt the areas, road crossing culverts” (HW3). As for stating any other comments or opinions they have, only two responded. One individual said “P.A.I needed in a lot of traditional territory. Remember traditional territory is not limited to registered trap line areas” (HW3), while another stated, “Must have an East Side Plan and follow it. East Side people must be consulted on any development” (HW19).

In addition to indicating whether or not the route option will affect their moose, caribou or hunting areas, the participants were asked to fill out a check box of all the impacts which they think may occur during the construction or operation phases of the project. It is

apparent that there is a lot of concern for new access to hunting areas for others to use, as well as new hunting areas for the community to explore. Table A6-35 demonstrates what the participants think some impacts may be.

Table A6 - 35: Hollow Water - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to hunt	10
More amount of animals to hunt	2
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to hunt	13
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to hunt	14
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	9
New access to hunting areas for others to use	7
New hunting areas for the community to explore	4
In-migration of new or more animals resulting in more animals to hunt	2
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	6
Increased participation / interest in hunting	7

Along with the suggested impacts the route options may impose, the participants were asked to check off the mitigations which they feel should be implemented. Table A6-36 below demonstrates the suggested mitigation measures the project should take. According to the respondents concerns, the respondents feel that the road should be patrolled and that the construction phase should be implemented in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 36: Hollow Water - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	7
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	9
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	8
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	7
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	13

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting Birds

Of the 30 participants, 18 have indicated that they actively hunt birds. For those that actively hunt birds, 12 have responded “No” when asked if the route options will affect bird hunting in any of the areas.

Respondents were given the opportunity to express their concerns and provide comments on the route options. Similar to that of trapping and hunting, the participants think that most of the impacts will happen during the construction phase. The main concern, as HW22 puts it “wild life season and fishing camps opening year round should be better controlled by community residents.” With respect to the operation phase of the project, there seems to be concerns with operations of RRRA, TEMBEC, mining, cottage development and forestry activities. As HW18 mentions, “chemical spraying will affect all animals”; “Using planes and not experienced guides” (HW19); “Mining, cottage development, forestry activities, road development and tourism” (HW30). Other comments by the respondents include: “Road building will access the areas to non-First Nation hunters, more hunters to the area.” (HW2); “A need to identify the impact of food chain link, HW needs trained technicians in natural resource management accredited programs.” (HW3); “Consultation and having a business plan. East side is not just hunting and killing wildlife. It should be used as an educational area for future generation.” (HW19)

Along with their comments regarding the impacts during the construction and operation phases, participants were asked to fill out a check box of other effects that may occur in the general vicinity of their hunting areas. Table A6-37 below illustrates the number of times the suggested impact was checked off, meaning the number of participants that agree with those effects occurring. Based on the information below, the participants seem to be concerned with “new access to hunting areas for others to use”, and “new hunting areas for the community to explore”.

Table A6 - 37: Hollow Water - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Bird Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	10
More amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	4
Disrupted migration of birds and waterfowl leading to less amount of animals to hunt	9
Habitat destruction leading to less birds and waterfowl to hunt	10
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	10
New access to hunting areas for others to use	5
New hunting areas for the community to explore	5
In-migration of new or more birds and waterfowl resulting in more animals to hunt	4
Increased accidents between road users and birds and waterfowl resulting in less to birds and waterfowl to hunt (fatalities)	7
Increased participation / interest in hunting	5

Along with the impact chart for the participants to fill out, they were also asked to fill out a similar chart to indicate the suggested mitigation measures. Table A6-38 below demonstrates what the participants think the mitigation measures should be. The majority of the respondents indicated that the road construction and operation should be implemented in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 38: Hollow Water - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Bird Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	3
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	5
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	6
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	6
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	10

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Fishing

Of the 30 participants, 21 have indicated that they actively fish. Of those that actively fish, 4 had indicated that the spawning areas will not be affected by route options, and 9 had indicated that the spawning areas will be affected. Respondent HW2 indicates that “in area 2, Rice River Area, bridge disrupts river beds, and in area 3, Wanipigow River, tanks spills dangerous goods”. HW3 express his/her opinion that “the effect depends on bridge structures and tembecs”. HW21 indicates that “whenever there are developments, there are impacts on every thing disruption of food chain link”.

The participants were given the opportunity to provide their input on what they think the impacts will be during the construction and operation phases. It appears that 17 of the respondents did not have any answer for the question of if they think impacts will occur during the construction phase. However, those that did provide answers indicated that there will be impacts. Ten (10) respondents were concerned about the creeks and rivers being affected by construction activities. Two of the comments by HW19 and HW29 are reproduced below:

- “Winter road making blocking streams, rivers, logging etc.” (HW19)
- “Water table contamination.” (HW29)

As for comments regarding the operation phase of the project, 17 did not provide any opinion. However, of those that did, they had issues with the operation process. For instance, HW19 stated that: “Need experienced fishermen to locate those areas and protect them. Mines, loggings, spills of waste used by these development, somebody has to monitor the companies.” Respondents HW3, HW4, HW21 and HW30 were concerned about the effect which mining, logging, tourism, TEMBEC, RRRRA, forestry and cottage development will have on fishing. Comments from the respondents include: “Fish spawning is sensitive to chemical spills, it will kill fish when it happens, gas, other dangerous goods” (HW2); “FN must play in co-management and partnership roles as well as managing” (HW3); “Consultation like commercial fishermen manage the fishery and habitats and when to fish. Do proper monitoring – reporting” (HW19).

With respect to other effects which they think will occur, participants were given a check box to fill, by indicating which other effects they think the new road will bring. According to the participants, the main impacts that will occur in the vicinity of the fishing areas are: new access to fishing area for others to use, and new fishing areas for the community to explore.

Table A6 - 39: Hollow Water - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Fishing Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less fish	9
More fish	1
Disrupted migration of animals preying on fish which leads to larger amount of fish to hunt	9
Habitat destruction leading to less fish species to hunt	10
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less fishing	10
New access to fishing area for others to use	7
New fishing areas for the community to explore	7
In-migration of new animals resulting in less fish.	4
Potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals you hunt / trap	7
Increased participation / interest in fishing	6

Along with the perceived impacts the route options may have, participants were asked to indicate what their suggested mitigation measures would be. Table A6-40 below illustrates what mitigation measures the people want implemented. According to the respondents, the top three mitigation measures are: ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way; provide road patrolling; and provide road blocks where access to trap lines begins.

Table A6 - 40: Hollow Water - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Fishing Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	10
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	4
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	11
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	7
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	12
Other (please indicate)	4

Spawning

Knowledge of spawning is important to the MBR Project as it may assist in localizing the sensitive areas and therefore minimizing impacts. Out of the 30 respondents, 14 answered this question; 14 participants indicated knowledge of spawning areas, while 13 of them seem to know which types of fish spawn.

Those who did know of spawning responded by stating a) fish types; and b) traditional spawning activity. Fish types include: white fish, red sucker, pickerel, jackfish, perch, mullet, Mariah, pike, sturgeon, brook trout, sunfish, sauger, bass and gold eye. According to the respondents, these fish will spawn in creeks, rapids and rivers. Thus, there are concerns with the route options affecting the fishing spawn areas. For instance:

- “Fish spawning is sensitive to chemical spills.” (HW2)
- “Winter road making blocking streams, rivers, logging, etc.” (HW19)
- “Yes, in some areas.” (HW26)

See Appendix 6.2 for full list of comments.

General Wildlife

With respect to the wildlife, majority of the respondents have indicated that they know where there are lynx, wolves, bears and other predator animals. Of the 30 respondents, 19 have indicated they know where lynx are; 24 respondents show they know of wolves; and 24 have stated they know where bears are. The respondents HW10, HW13 and HW29 indicate that other predator animals exist in the area without stating which types. When asked if the road will affect predator routes, only 14 of the 30 participants responded yes. Twelve (12) of the respondents were concerned that the predator routes will be affected, for example:

- “Yes, more traffic in the area.” (HW2)
- “Animals migrate in different patterns depend on food supply.” (HW3)
- “Pushing more bears to the Lake on Trap Area 1.” HW20)

Thirteen (13) of the respondents were not concerned with the predator routes being affected, for example:

- “There will always be bears and wolves.” (HW8)
- “The Rice River Road is already there.” (HW17)
- “Not now but road will change all that.” (HW19)
- “Lynx will be in rabbit area.” (HW11)

Participants were also asked if they know of any eagle, hawk, osprey, falcon, owl, heron, and other bird nests. Of the 30 participants, 17 indicated that they know of these animals.

Furthermore, the participants were asked if they know of any effects that may occur on the existing environment. Thirteen (13) of the 30 responded with “Yes” to effects on existing environment; some of the respondents were:

- “Any habitat destruction or altering will result in animals and birds moving to a different location.” (HW3)
- “Disrupting habitat – breaking food chain link.” (HW4)
- “Less sighting.” (HW5 and HW6)
- “Birds will move from area because of noise from traffic.” (HW18)
- “Noise, people interest, spring time persons, should not be allowed into habitat when wild game is producing young ones.” (HW19)
- “Food chain link will be break. Takes years to bring back to normal, if at all.” (HW21 and HW30)
- “Polluting.” (HW27)
- “There will be no wildlife.” (HW28)
- “Widespread contamination by humans and machines.” (HW29)

Seven (7) of the respondents answered “No” to the question as they think there are no impact on the existing government. Some of the responses were:

- “No, the Rice River road is already there.” (HW1 and HW17)
- “Road already there and should not have any impact.” (HW11)
- “No, they are by the Lake. Km 61 must need to be looked at.” (HW9)

Finally, respondents were asked to provide some input on what problems the Project should be aware of. Of the 30 respondents, 8 provided their thoughts on the issue. According to the responses provided, issues relating to poaching, loss of control of their land and environmental disasters were raised, as mentioned below:

- “More poaching by more non First Nations, more sport hunting, oil and gas, dangerous goods being spilled into the rivers and streams on roads.” (HW2)
- “Leases and permits for development.” (HW3)
- “No hunting restriction zones, taking away former hunting areas.” (HW21).
- “Lose control of our land use.” (HW27)
- “Environmental disasters.” (HW29)

For detailed list of all comments regarding the general wildlife, see Appendix 6.2.

Cultural Areas

Participants were asked to answer questions regarding various cultural areas including burial and historical grounds, medicinal areas, berry gathering, and other areas. The respondents were asked to check off either “yes”, “no” or “not in the area”. Of the 30 respondents, 20 have indicated that they know of burial grounds and historical settlement/camps in the area. 14 of the participants have indicated that they know of medicinal areas. While 20 of the respondents have indicated they know of berry gathering areas. Twelve (12) participants knew of other areas to avoid.

When asked if there are other areas to avoid, 14 of the 30 participants replied ‘No.’ However, those that did reply with yes regarding other areas to avoid said that the reasons for avoiding such areas were:

- “Both sides of the roads used for berry and medicinal picking.” (HW2)
- “Minicactus, Seneca roots and sweet grass.” (HW3)
- “Traditional and heritage usage.” (HW4)
- “Rice River, minicactus.” (HW10)
- “Wanipigow River edges Rice River. Wild peppermint, wild pepper, wild ginger, juni berry etc.” (HW18)
- “Because any development kills a berry or medicinal place. Example, logging, they scrape the land only to grow trees that they want.” (HW19)
- “Rice River bridge area along English Brock less provision due to increased open area for influx of people. Same for all traditional areas up to straits.” (HW21)
- “Every natural resource is special within traditional territory including Black Island, Deer Island, up to Loon Strait plus RTL #8.” (HW30)

When asked about whether or not they believe the new road will affect their access or access by others to their areas of interest/traditional lands, 10 participants replied with a yes and provided reason as to why they are concerned with the new effects that the road will bring. According to the respondents, concerns were: poaching and night hunting (HW2); more sport fishing (HW5 and HW6); downsizing of traditional hunting area and loss of wildlife habitat (HW3); gas and oil spills pollution and destruction of wildlife habitat (HW2, HW19, HW21 and HW30).

Lastly, participants were given the chance to give any other information they would like to share with the project team that will aid in understanding how the road may affect them, their community and surrounding environment. The majority of the participants (23 out of 30) responded by either saying No or giving their opinion. To some of

respondents, the road will bring them positive affects in terms of the potential for development including:

- “We need own conservation officers and technicians locally to monitor and protect traditional territory.” (HW4)
- “I will like to see co-management with Hollow Water First Nation and government.” (HW24)
- “HW needs technicians trained, accredited, recognized staff to work on these issues to protect what is left.” (HW30)

There are also some negative effects the respondents feel will be a result of the road, including environmental effects. Such concerns include:

- “New road will bring in more cottage development, more people using the area. First Nation Treaty Rights being set aside to build the road, more government legislation. First Nation not part of development, economic development for only non- First Nation. First Nation only doing menial work – cheap labour, sign holder, go fors – etc. Forestry companies trying to access more traditional land from First nations without any benefit to local people. From the Rice River turn off due north to Saunder Arch area was used by the people of HWFN. The road site proposed is only a fraction of our peoples’ traditional lands. This was and is being used in conjunction with the season – summer – being medicinal picky, fall – being big game hunting, waterfowls, ducks, geese and harvesting of wild berry, winter trapping of fur being animals. Many people from HWFN still use the streams and rivers for traditional purpose and as such – care and responsibility should be taken when the upgrading of the road starts. Treaty rights of the people of the areas should be honoured.” (HW2)
- “I trap on the East Shore of Lake Wanipigiow South basin home block and I feel that I would be greatly impacted along with other trappers with registered trap lines. In this specific area, I believe the road will drive the animals and fur bearers further east of all weather road eliminating East Shore home block altogether. Trapping has been a family tradition and is an area that few families continue to practice. This traditional lifestyle will most definitely be greatly affected by an all weather road.” (HW20)
- “The social ill effects would include access to these communities by drug dealers, boot loggers etc. A closer look at social and environmental impacts on these communities needs to be considered.” (HW29)

For a full list of comments regarding cultural areas, see Appendix 6.2.

6.3.6 Little Grand Rapids

Trapping

Little Grand Rapids had 33 respondents with various opinions about the proposed road. Of the 33 participants, 27 actively trap. 15 answered “No” when asked whether any of the route options affect their trap lines. Respondents that gave reasons as to why the route options will not affect their trap lines mentioned that it is because the route is not in the vicinity of their trap lines:

- “No, it is out of area” (LGR9, LGR14, LGR26), “out of the way.” (LGR16)
- “No, even though road is coming through Home Block, it shouldn't affect trapping.” (LGR12)

A small amount of the participants – being 8 – responded by giving an answer of “Yes” to the question of whether or not the route options will affect their trap lines. Those that were concerned said:

- “Yes, it would disrupt hunting wildlife.” (LGR1)
- “Yes, will do something” (LGR3)
- “I have no trap line, but it will do some damage.” (LGR8)
- “Yes, it will scare off wildlife.” (LGR33)

The remaining 10 respondents either did not provide a concern about the road affecting their trap lines, or they were not trappers.

Furthermore, another effects question was asked about whether or not the road will make it harder for the trappers to get the same number of animals. The majority of the participants (11) said “No”, indicating that it will not make it harder for them to trap the same number of animals, while 6 respondents said “Yes.”

In addition to providing their input and their concerns with the route options, the respondents were asked to check off other impacts which they think may affect the road. Table A6-41 below demonstrates how many respondents agree that the suggested impact may occur in the area due to the road.

Table A6 - 41: Little Grand Rapids - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Trapping Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to trap	9
More animals to trap	3
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to trap	13
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to trap	13
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping	12
New access to trap lines for others to use	0
New hunting area for the community to explore	0
New or more animals resulting in more animals to trap	0
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to trap (fatalities)	11
Increased participation / interest in trapping	4

It appears that many respondents believe that the impacts will be

- Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to trap,
- Habitat destruction leading to less animals to trap,
- Loss of traditional practices and language due to less trapping, and
- Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to trap (fatalities)

In addition to the impacts which the respondents think may occur, they were also given the opportunity to check off the suggested mitigation measures. Table A6-42 below demonstrates how many people suggested what the mitigation measures should be:

Table A6 - 42: Little Grand Rapids - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Trapping Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	10
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	11
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	10
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	2
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	10

When asked about when the impacts will occur, either during construction or operation, as well as to provide other comments or opinions, most of the respondents were concerned about the impact of construction and operation on the land, surface waters, trees, and animals. The comments were as follows:

- “Probably construction cutting out roadway.” (LGR1)
- “Damage rivers, lakes, ponds.” (LGR3)
- “Damage forest.” (LGR8)
- “The construction destroys land, lakes and river.” (LGR5)
- “It will affect wildlife feeding grounds, destroying bush.” (LGR12)
- “Destroy wildlife, animals will die off.” (LGR24)
- “Will cut off rain and drainage” (LGR31)
- “Scare off wildlife.” (LGR33)

Not many of the participants were too concerned about the impacts happening during the operation phase. Those that were concerned were afraid of the trees getting lost (“the cutting down of trees”, PR16); or that there will be environmental impacts (“Lots of distraction”, LGR1); or about the traffic (“Too many vehicles when road is done.” LGR33); or its long-term effect (“it will affect long run”, LGR12).

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting

Of the 33 respondents, 29 actively hunt. The majority of those that actively hunt either moose, caribou or small game, feel as though that the route options will not affect their hunting areas (18 think that it will not affect the moose hunt area; 16 think it will not affect the caribou hunt area; 10 think it will not affect the small game hunt area).

The participants were asked to provide comments on what impacts may occur during the construction and operation phases of the project. Some participants are concerned about the impact the construction will have on their hunting by stating “destroying animal food” (LGR15), and “will affect moose routes” (LGR23). One individual was also concerned about the problems caused by construction – “blockage river, creek, lakes” (LGR22). One individual, however, has no concern about the project as “it will not affect my trapline” (LGR11).

In terms of the operation phase, not many respondents were concerned. There were comments, however, regarding the traffic, as one participant said, “Lots of entrance from vehicles presents” (LGR1). As for stating any other comments or opinions they have, only two responded. One individual said “You will notice some maps are not use, because people do not remember where they are” (LGR5), while another just stated “No” (LGR14).

In addition to indicating whether or not the route option will affect the moose, caribou or hunting areas, the participants were asked to fill out a check box of all the impacts which they think may occur during the construction or operation phases of the project. It is apparent that the top five concerns are as follows: Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities); Habitat destruction leading to less animals to hunt; Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to hunt; Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting; and less animals to hunt. Table A6-43 demonstrates what the participants think some impacts may be.

Table A6 - 43: Little Grand Rapids - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less animals to hunt	8
More amount of animals to hunt	1
Disrupted migration of animals leading to less amount of animals to hunt	9
Habitat destruction leading to less animals to hunt	10
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	8
New access to hunting areas for others to use	1
New hunting areas for the community to explore	2
In-migration of new or more animals resulting in more animals to hunt	0
Increased accidents between road users and animals resulting in less animals to hunt (fatalities)	10
Increased participation / interest in hunting	3

Along with the suggested impacts the route options may impose, the participants were asked to check off the mitigations which they feel should be implemented. Table A6-44 below demonstrates the suggested mitigation measures the project should take. According to the respondents concerns, the respondents feel that the road should be patrolled, road users should be controlled by establishing control point offices along the road way, local and provincial legislation should be implemented with bans on road use to those other than the community, and that the construction phase should be implemented in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 44: Little Grand Rapids - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Large and Small Game Hunting Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	10
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	10
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	10
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	2
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	10

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Hunting Birds

Of the 33 participants, 29 have indicated that they actively hunt birds. For those that actively hunt birds, 22 have responded “No” when asked if the route options will affect bird hunting in any of the areas.

Respondents were given the opportunity to express their concerns and provide comments on the route options. Only three participants responded. Two participants think that the impacts will happen during the construction phase, as PR13 puts it “Upon Construction”; or as PR39 says, “After construction, people fuelling garbage”. However, one individual, LGR5, does not seem to have concern about the project by saying “It won’t affect migratory birds because they fly”. With respect to the operation phase of the project, one individual expresses a concern for the traffic as LGR1 mentions, “too much traffic”. Participants were also asked to provide any additional comments. LGR5 says “we hunted geese and birds anywhere”.

Along with their comments regarding the impacts during the construction and operation phases, participants were asked to fill out a check box of other effects that may occur in the general vicinity of their hunting areas. Table A6-45 below illustrates the number of times the suggested impact was checked off, representing the number of the participants that agree with those effects occurring.

Table A6 - 45: Little Grand Rapids - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Bird Hunting Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	3
More amount of birds and waterfowl to hunt	0
Disrupted migration of birds and waterfowl leading to less amount of animals to hunt	3
Habitat destruction leading to less birds and waterfowl to hunt	3
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less hunting	2
New access to hunting areas for others to use	1
New hunting areas for the community to explore	1
In-migration of new or more birds and waterfowl resulting in more animals to hunt	2
Increased accidents between road users and birds and waterfowl resulting in less to birds and waterfowl to hunt (fatalities)	2
Increased participation / interest in hunting	1

Along with the impact chart for the participants to fill out, they were also asked to fill out a similar chart, indicating the suggested mitigation measures. Table A6-46 below

demonstrates what the participants think the mitigation measures should be. The majority of the respondents indicated that there should be road patrolling; control point office; provincial legislation; and ensure that construction occurs in an environmentally responsible way.

Table A6 - 46: Little Grand Rapids- Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Hunting Birds Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	3
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	3
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	3
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	1
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	3

For a full, detailed list regarding the comments and concerns, as well as suggested impacts and mitigation measures, see Appendix 6.2.

Fishing

Of the 33 participants, 29 have indicated that they actively fish. Of those that actively fish, 5 had indicated that the spawning areas will not be affected. 4 of them explicitly say “No”; one respondent, LGR12, states, “probably not”; and LGR21 says “Out of area/Routes wouldn’t reach area”. Six (6) respondents expressed concerns to different degrees in terms of the proposed routes affecting the spawning areas:

- “It will destroy spawning area, chemicals.” (LGR5)
- “Cutting trees block waterways.” (LGR11).
- “Only if they use chemicals.” (LGR26)

The participants were given the opportunity to provide their input on what they think the impacts will be during the construction and operation phases. It appears that 30 of the respondents did not have any answer for the question of if they think impacts will occur during the construction phase. However, those that did provide answers indicated that

there will be impacts. Three (3) respondents were concerned about the creeks and rivers:

- “Might drown rivers, lakes, block them.” (LGR1)
- “Blockage of rivers, lakes, streams where fish spawn.” (LGR5)
- “Spoil river & lakes.” (LGR31)

As for comments regarding the operation phase of the project, 32 did not provide any opinion. The only respondent states that “People stepping to fish anywhere” (LGR1). In terms of giving other concerns or opinions, none of the respondents had anything to say.

With respect to other effects which they think will occur, participants were given a check box to fill to indicate which other effects they think the new road will bring. According to the participants, the main impacts that will occur in the vicinity of the fishing areas are: less fish; disrupted migration of animals preying on fish which leads to larger amount of fish to hunt; habitat destruction leading to less fish species to hunt; loss of traditional practices and language due to less fishing; and potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals you hunt/trap.

Table A6 - 47: Little Grand Rapids - Respondents Views on Potential Effects of All-Season Road on Fishing Activity

Potential effect	Number of supporting answers
Less fish	7
More fish	0
Disrupted migration of animals preying on fish which leads to larger amount of fish to hunt	7
Habitat destruction leading to less fish species to hunt	7
Loss of traditional practices and language due to less fishing	7
New access to fishing area for others to use	0
New fishing areas for the community to explore	0
In-migration of new animals resulting in less fish.	0
Potentially contaminated water sources killing fish and poisoning other animals you hunt / trap	7
Increased participation / interest in fishing	2

Along with the perceived impacts the route options may have, participants were asked to indicate what their suggested mitigation measures would be. Table A6-48 below illustrates what mitigation measures the people want implemented. According to the respondents, the top four mitigation measures are: provide road patrolling; control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way; Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community; and ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way.

Table A6 - 48: Little Grand Rapids - Mitigation Measures Suggested By Respondents to Reduce Impacts on Fishing Activity

Suggested Mitigation	Number of supporting answers
Provide road patrolling	7
Control road users by establishing control point offices along the road way.	7
Implement local and provincial legislation with bans on road use to those other than the community	7
Provide road blocks where access to trap lines begin	0
Ensure road construction and operation is implemented in an environmental responsible way	7

Spawning

Knowledge of spawning is important to the MBR Project as it may assist in localizing the sensitive areas and therefore minimizing impacts. Out of the 33 respondents, 28 answered this question; 22 participants indicated knowledge of spawning areas, while 22 seem to know which types of fish spawn.

Those who did know of spawning responded by stating a) fish types; and b) traditional spawning activity. Fish types include: white fish, red sucker, pickerel, jackfish, perch, mullet, Mariah, pike, sturgeon, brook trout, and gold eye. According to the respondents, these fish will spawn in creeks, rapids and rivers. Thus, there are concerns with the route options affecting the fishing spawn areas. For instance:

- “It will destroy spawning area, chemicals.” (LGR5)
- “Cutting trees, blocking waterways.” (LGR7,LGR11)
- “White people too many.” (LGR20)
- “Only if they use chemicals.” (LGR26)

See Appendix 6.2 for full list of comments.

General Wildlife

With respect to the wildlife, approximately one third of the respondents have indicated that they know where there are lynx, wolves, bears and other predator animals. Of the 33 respondents, 4 have indicated they know where lynx are; 10 respondents show they know of wolves; and 10 have stated they know where bears are. When asked if the road will affect predator routes, only 2 of the 33 participants responded positively by saying “Spring time” (LGR7), and “Spring time travel in palteern” (LGR11). Ten (10) of the respondents were not concerned with the predator routes being affected, for example:

- “Out of area.” (LGR9)
- “No, road comes in from south most animal on reserves.” (LGR12)
- “No, too far.” (LGR19)

Participants were also asked if they know of any eagle, hawk, osprey, falcon, owl, heron, and other bird nests. Of the 33 participants, 1 indicated that they know of these animals.

Furthermore, the participants were asked if they know of any effects that may occur on the existing environment. Eight (8) people of the 33 responded positively to effects on existing environment. Some of the responses were:

- “Lots of cutting trees, damage rivers, lakes.” (LGR1)
- “Destroy it.” (LGR11)
- “Won’t affect the environment only/ too much fishing.” (LGR19)
- “Rivers block, lake contaminated.” (LGR22)
- “I think they should let everything stay the same, not to build a road at all.” (LGR24)
- “Just leave it the way it is, nobody asked for a road to be built, I did not.” (LGR27)
- “Damage forest due to cutting.” (LGR31)

Five (5) of the respondents answered negatively to the question as they think there are no impact on the existing government. Some of the responses were:

- “Out of area.” (LGR9)
- “It will damage some forest, but not enough to damage environment.” (LGR12)

And the rest of the participants did not provide any opinions on this question, or says “don’t know”.

Finally, respondents were asked to provide some input on what problems the Project should be aware of. Of the 33 respondents, only one (LGR14) provided some thoughts on the issue.

For detailed list of all comments regarding the general wildlife, see Appendix 6.2.

Cultural Areas

Participants were asked to answer questions regarding various cultural areas including burial and historical grounds; medicinal areas; berry gathering; and other areas. The respondents were asked to check off either “yes”, “no” or “not in the area”. Of the 33 respondents, 2 have indicated that they know of burial grounds and historical settlement/camps in the area. 4 of the participants have indicated that they know of medicinal areas. While 1 of the respondents has indicated they know of berry gathering areas. No participants knew of other areas to avoid.

When asked if there are other areas to avoid, 26 of the 33 participants replied “No”. However, one respondent did reply with yes regarding other areas to avoid, and he/she explains the reason for avoiding such areas by saying “local places are reserve.” (LGR12). Some other comments are:

- “Maps are not in use, people don’t want to share information.” (LGR5)
- “Some maps are not fill out because don’t know.” (LGR26)

When asked about whether or not they believe the new road will affect their access or access by others to their areas of interest/traditional lands, 15 participants replied with a “yes” and provided reason as to why they are concerned with the new effects that the road will bring. According to the respondents, concerns were: “Yes, there will be too many white people taking advantage of easy access” (LGR1); “access is too easy, people will build cabin, too much activity from outside, lots of alcohol and drugs” (LGR5); “white people will come build cabins outpost lamps” (LGR7); “Too many white people, too many youths would steel vehicles. Too much alcohol, drugs, and gangs” (LGR11); “white man will come; it will destroy our traditional area. Have to pay to go to the trapline” (LGR20); “The white people will come destroy land, harvest, the lakes, fish out lakes too. Many Americans will come” (LGR24); “Yes, it will affect everything. Most of the people don’t really know where traditional grounds are. So I think it should be left alone and not bothered” (LGR27); “Yes, It will make aforementioned areas more accessible and therefore more vulnerable to pollution and possible vandalism. These areas should be protected” (LGR28); “white man will take over everything; logging, fishing, camps, hunting, bring alcohol, too many deaths” (LGR30); “more activity from white people, less animals. Building of cabins by whites” (LGR31).

Lastly, participants were given the chance to give any other information they would like to share with the project team that will aid in understanding how the road may affect them, their community and surrounding environment. The majority of the participants (28 out of 33) responded by either saying No or giving their opinion. To some of respondents, the road will bring them positive affects including cheaper costs for food and fuel. Those that indicated these positive effects said:

- “Wouldn’t destroy land.” (LGR4)
- “Road will be good to decrease cost of living. Air plane transportation is so expensive. Road will be good to community house.” (LGR14)

However, most respondents state negative effects which they think will be a result of the road, including environmental effects. Such concerns include:

- “Damage forest, alcohol and drugs.” (LGR7)
- “Too much outsider will kill off wildlife, fish out lakes. Better enforcement.” (LGR19)
- “Accident, more alcohol, drugs.” (LGR20)
- “Will increase (or result in) lots of accidents due to alcohol and drugs. It will distract wild life and our people will be affected by this. Build outpost along the road.” (LGR24)
- “While the road will make it easier to get cheaper food and transportation, it will also open up our lake to invasive species that might come in on boats and what not, and will obviously affect our own wildlife with detrimental affects.” (LGR28)