

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPONENT: Ernie Bussidor and Tom Fortin - Sayisi Dene
First Nation
PROPOSAL NAME: Proposed Winter Road Development -
Tadoule Lake to Lynn Lake
CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT: 2
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Transportation
CLIENT FILE NO.: 4227.00

OVERVIEW:

The Proposal was dated January 9, 1997 and was received on January 10, 1997. The advertisement of the Proposal read as follows:

"A Proposal filed by Ernie Bussidor and Tom Fortin of the Sayisi Dene First Nation Band to construct a overland winter road linking Tadoule Lake with Lynn Lake. The purpose of this project is to provide an alternate route to avoid the unsafe ice conditions experienced along the existing winter road between Tadoule Lake and South Indian Lake. The project is scheduled to be completed and opened before the winter road construction and operation season closes at the end of March 1997."

The Proposal was advertised in the Flin Flon Weekly Reminder on Friday, January 31, 1997, the Northern Life & Times on Wednesday, January 31, 1997 and the North Star at the end of January, 1997. It was placed in the Main Registry, the Manitoba Eco-Network, the Centennial Public Library, the L.G.D. of Lynn Lake Office. In addition, Sayisi Dene First Nation Band Office at Tadoule Lake was made available as a registry for public review of the Proposal. It was also distributed to the "Transportation" TAC members for review. All comments were requested by February 17, 1997.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

" Trapper" Don McCrea
General Manager
Big Sand Lake Lodge
Room 1, International Inn
1808 Wellington Avenue
Winnipeg, MB. R3H 0G3

- letter dated February 17, 1997
- request detailed information on what effect the winter road development will have on Big Sand Lake Lodge and Outcamps. Enclosed a copy of a report to

the Minister of Tourism outlining the investment and time it has taken to develop the lodge and outcamps. Also enclosed a copy of a Northwest World Traveler magazine article and video on Big Sand Lake Lodge.

.../2

Project Review Summary

Page -2-

COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Manitoba Natural Resources Request that the following additional information on the Proposal be provided:

1) Project Justification

The existing winter road bisects Sand Lake Provincial Park. DNR favours relocating the road outside the park but requires justification for a new route.

2) Location

More detail on the actual road location is required. The route shown should indicate the exact location of stream crossings and land formations such as eskers relative to the road location.

3) Engineering / Construction Plans

The engineering and construction plans for the development are required. This would include a description of the proposed width of the road, the extent of clearing required along the route, the number and sizes of the stream crossings, the method of stream crossings and the construction methods intended to mitigate the impacts associated with any impacts to the stream bank approach slopes.

4) Operation and Maintenance

Additional information is required to detail the operational aspects of the proposed road such as the number of heavy trucks which would be expected to use the road and over what time period annually, public use of the proposed road and any restrictions on access and commercial user fees and the anticipated opening and closing of the road under normal conditions in future years.

5) Bio-physical Impacts and Mitigation

The statement made in the Proposal that there will be little or no impact on wildlife should be substantiated. In particular, the proposed route will cross the main wintering route for the Beverly-Qamanirjuag caribou herd. The impact of additional hunting pressure created by the new access and the impact of possible displacement of the herd should be addressed. The proposed route follows an area of eskers which are known to be sensitive land formations. The Province has recently shown an interest in one of these eskers, the Robertson Esker. Possible impacts to these land formations due to the construction and operation of the road should be addressed.

.../3

Project Review Summary

Page -3-

6) Socio-Economic Impacts and Mitigation

Information should be provided which describes the possible impacts on existing tourism operations or communities affected by the location of the new route and any mitigation proposed to offset these impacts.

Disposition: The proponent will be requested in writing to provide the additional requirements as detailed in the comments from DNR.

Manitoba Environment - Water Quality Recommend that stream crossings should be constructed in accordance with the guidelines in the Recommended Fish Protection Procedures for Stream Crossings in Manitoba, 1996. Precautions should be taken to prevent erosion and sedimentation. Trailer and fuel tankers and fuel storage facilities should be located 100 m from water bodies.

Disposition: The comments can be accommodated as conditions of the licence.

Manitoba Environment - Northern Region No specific concerns. Recommend that applicable regulations for northern construction projects be followed including construction camps, sewage disposal, solid waste disposal, drinking water, waste soils, borrow pits, and gasoline, diesel and oil.

Historic Resources No concerns with regard to the project's potential to impact heritage resources.

Mines Branch No concerns.

Health No concerns

Highways MHT expects that the proposed development will have a potential impact on the Provincial Road System, especially where access is required for the winter road onto PR 394. The proponent is required to apply for an access permit for connecting the winter road to PR 394. The access must be placed in a non-restricted passing and stopping distance location and should be removed each year to permit normal drainage along PR 394. MHT requests that the proponent inform them of the project's status, in terms of construction schedules, road conditions, and opening and closing dates.

Disposition: Highways request will be transmitted to the proponent in the Licence letter of transmittal.

Rural Development No land use concerns.

.../4

Project Review Summary

Page -4-

Fisheries and Oceans DFO has concluded that the project is not likely to cause significant adverse effects on fish and fish habitat provided the following mitigation measures are followed:

- 1) The "Manitoba Stream Crossings Guidelines, May 1996" are followed.
- 2) Appropriate precautions should be taken to ensure that deleterious substances do not enter any fish bearing watercourse as is prohibited under the *Fisheries Act*.
- 3) Fill for ice bridges and approach slopes consist only of snow and/or clean, delimbed logs cabled together. All debris (including reinforcement logs) are removed from the watercourses before spring breakup.
- 4) Ice bridges are located at sites with gently sloping banks to minimize cuts to watercourse banks. Snow and ice should be used to slope approaches wherever possible, rather than cut banks. Any cut stream banks or exposed soils are to be stabilized against erosion prior to spring run-off and until revegetation is successful and the transport of erodible soils is controlled.

Disposition: The mitigation measures detailed above can be accommodated as conditions of licencing.

Canadian Coast Guard No concerns. Request that no debris be left on the ice that may end up in watercourses.

Disposition: Comment can be accommodated as a condition of Licencing as noted under the DFO comments above.

FOLLOW-UP:

On March 11, 1997 the Director of Approvals wrote to the proponents requesting additional information on the Proposal with respect to: 1) project justification, 2) location, 3) engineering/construction plans, 4) operation and maintenance, 5) bio-physical impacts and mitigation and 6) socio-economic impacts and mitigation. The respondent to the Environment Act advertisement of the Proposal was notified in writing that additional information had been requested for review prior to a decision concerning a recommendation for public hearings and subsequent Environment Act licencing of the Proposal.

The proponents filed the additional information on May 14, 1997. Comments on the additional information was received on from Natural Resources on July 14, 1997. Natural Resources reported that because the additional information did little to address their previous comments and concerns including justification for the project and bio-physical impacts, they could not support the proposal.

...5

Project Review Summary **Page -5-**

On July 17, 1997, the Director of Approvals advised the proponents in writing that in view of Natural Resources outstanding concerns, he had decided to not proceed further with the Environment Act review process for the Proposal. However, Approvals Branch would be prepared to re-initiate the process provided support from the Department of Natural Resources is obtained. A copy of Natural Resources comments of July 17, 1997 were enclosed.

On September 30, 1997 Natural Resources notified the Director of Approvals that DNR has met with the proponents regarding DNR's previous comments on the project and were now satisfied that the issues previously raised can be adequately managed by the proponent. Therefore DNR had no concerns with the project proceeding.

PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing is not recommended. The decision to not recommend a public hearing is made on the basis that only one letter was received in response to the advertisement of the proposal which relates to the effect that the project would have on Big Sand Lake Lodge and outcamps. The Proposal indicates that there are no lodges within 80 kilometers of the proposed route and therefore the road will not have an adverse effect on these operations.

RECOMMENDATION:

DNR has reported that their previous concerns have been addressed. The comments provided by other TAC reviewers can be accommodated as conditions of licencing for the project. Therefore, it is recommended that the Development be licenced under The Environment Act subject to the limits, terms and conditions as described in the attached Draft Environment Act Licence. It is further recommended that enforcement of the Licence be assigned to the Manitoba Environment Northern Region.